Encyclopedia Talmudit - Redemption of the Firstborn - Pidjon HaBen

Zadoq ben Aahron

אנציקלופדיה תלמודית:פדיון הבן

Encyclopedia Talmudit: Redemption of the Firstborn - Pidjon HaBen

Redemption of the Firstborn - Pidjon HaBen - The commandment of the redemption of a firstborn human*.

1. The Commandment · **HaMitzvah · המצוה**

1.1 The Father’s Obligation · **Mitzvat HaAv · מצות האב**
1.2 The Mother · **HaEm · האם**
1.3 One’s Own Obligation · **Mitzvat Atzmo · מצות עצמו**
1.4 The Court · **Beit Din · בית דין**
1.5 The Father’s Obligation Once the Son Has Grown · **Mitzvat HaAv MiShehigdil HaBen · מצות האב משהגדיל הבן**
1.6 After the Firstborn Has Died · **Le’achar Mitat HaBechor · לאחר מיתת הבכור**
1.7 Definition of the Father’s Obligation · **Geder Chiyuv HaAv · גדר חיוב האב**
1.8 The Mitzvah of Education · **Mitzvat Chinuch · מצות חינוך**
1.9 The Kohen’s Obligation · **Mitzvat HaKohen · מצות הכהן**
1.10 Place of the Obligation · **Makom Chiyuva · מקום חיובה**
1.11 Time of the Obligation · **Zman Chiyuva · זמן חיובה**
1.12 Benefit from the Firstborn · **Hana’ah Min HaBechor · הנאה מן הבכור**
1.13 Renewed Obligation at Any Time · **Chiyuv Mechudash BeChol Et · חיוב מחודש בכל עת**
2. The Time · **HaZman · הזמן**
2.1 Time the Obligation Takes Effect · **Zman Chalut HaChiyuv · זמן חלות החיוב**
2.2 Stayed in an Incubator · **Shehah BeIncubator · שהה באינקובטור**
2.3 Time of Viability · **Zman HaKiyum · זמן הקיום**
2.4 When It Falls on Shabbat · **KsheZmana BeShabbat · כשזמנה בשבת**
2.5 At Night · **BaLayla · בלילה**
2.6 When It Falls on a Fast Day · **KsheZmano BeYom Ta’anit · כשזמנו ביום תענית**
2.7 Before the Circumcision · **Be’od SheLo Nimol · בעוד שלא נימול**
2.8 Redemption Before Its Time · **Pidyon Kodem Zmano · פדיון קודם זמנו**
2.9 Redemption Within the Time \[235] · **Pidyon Toch HaZman \[235] · פדיון תוך הזמן \[235]**
3. The Money · **HaKesef · הכסף**
3.1 Additional Fifth · **Tosefet Chomesh · תוספת חומש**
3.2 Object Given to the Kohen · **Chefetz LiTenoh LaKohen · חפץ ליתנו לכהן**
3.3 Redemption with a Loan · **Pidyon BeMilveh · פדיון במלוה**

4. The Redemption · HaPidyon · הפדיון
4.1 Nature of the Redemption · Mehut HaPidyon · מהות הפדיון
4.2 Dividing the Redemption · Chilek Et HaPidyon · חילק את הפדיון
4.3 A Kohen Who Is Obligated in Redemption · Kohen HaMechuyav BePidyon · כהן המחויב בפדיון
4.4 When the Son Is Not With Him · KsheEin HaBen Etzlo · כשאין הבן אצלו
4.5 Seizure · Tefisah · תפיסה
4.6 Lien · Shi’abud · שעבוד
4.7 Assets Acquired After the Redemption Obligation · Nechasim SheBa’u LeAchar Chiyuv HaPidyon · נכסים שבאו לאחר חיוב הפדיון
4.8 Time of Lien on the Son’s Assets · Zman HaShi’abud Al Nechsei HaBen · זמן השעבוד על נכסי הבן
4.9 Compulsion · Kefiyah · כפיה
4.10 Agent · Shaliach · שליח
4.11 Redemption by Others · Pidyon Al Yedei Acherim · פדיון על ידי אחרים
4.12 A Minor Redeeming Himself · Pediyat Katan Et Atzmo · פדיית קטן את עצמו
5. The Kohen · HaKohen · הכהן
5.1 A Blind Kohen · Kohen Suma · כהן סומא
5.2 The Kohen’s Agent · Shaliach HaKohen · שליח הכהן
5.3 Acquiring for the Kohen · LeZechot LaKohen · לזכות לכהן
5.4 An Unconfirmed Kohen · Kohen SheEino Mevorar · כהן שאינו מבורר
6. The Blessings · HaBerachot · הברכות
7. Customs of the Redemption · Minhagei HaPidyon · מנהגי הפדיון
7.1 Meal · Se’udah · סעודה
7.2 Meal at Redemption of a Deceased Son · Se’udah BePidyon Ben SheMet · סעודה בפדיון בן שמת
7.3 Presence of Ten · Ma’amad Asarah · מעמד עשרה
7.4 Standing · Amidah · עמידה
7.5 Giving the Firstborn to the Kohen · Netinat HaBechor LaKohen · נתינת הבכור לכהן
7.6 Wrapping the Firstborn · Ituf HaBechor · עיטוף הבכור
7.7 Participation of the Mother · Hishtatfut HaEm · השתתפות האם
7.8 Verifying the Firstborn · Birur HaBechorah · בירור הבכורה
7.9 Question of Preference · She’elat HaHe’adafah · שאלת ההעדפה
7.10 Intent of the Question and Answer · Kavanat HaShe’elah VeHaTeshuvah · כוונת השאלה והתשובה
7.11 Bringing the Money in a Vessel · Hava’at HaMa’ot BeKli · הבאת המעות בכלי
7.12 Order of Blessings and Giving · Seder HaBerachot VeHaNetina · סדר הברכות והנתינה
7.13 Reciting the Redemption · Amirat HaPidyon · אמירת הפדיון
7.14 Blessing over the Cup · Beracha Al HaKos · ברכה על הכוס
7.15 Formula of Exchange and the Kohen’s Blessing · Nusach Chalifin UBerachat HaKohen · נוסח חליפין וברכת הכהן
7.16 “That the Joy Is in His Dwelling” · SheHaSimcha BiMe’ono · שהשמחה

במעונו
8. Footnotes · **He’arot Shulayim · הערות שוליים

The Commandment

Commandments of the Father

A positive commandment* from the Torah to redeem every man of Israel his son who is the firstborn to his Israelite mother[1], as it is said: And every firstborn of man among your sons you shall redeem[2], and it is said: The firstborn of your sons you shall give to Me[3], and it is said: Every firstborn of the womb is Mine, etc. every firstborn of your sons you shall redeem[4], and it is said: But you shall surely redeem the firstborn of man[5].

The commandment is counted in the enumeration of the commandments*[6]. Regarding the firstborn who must be redeemed, see also Firstborn of Man: Firstborn to a Priest[7].

Is

The commandment of the redemption of the firstborn is imposed on the father and not on the mother[8], and the woman is not obligated to redeem her son[9], as it is said: “You shall surely redeem”[10], and the scripture is read as “you shall redeem” - to redeem others[11] - and in any case, it can also be read as “you shall be redeemed” - to redeem yourself[12] - anyone who is commanded to redeem himself, and that is a man, that if his father did not redeem him, he is commanded in his own redemption[13], is commanded to redeem his son, and a woman who is not commanded to redeem herself[14], is not commanded to redeem her son[15].

Commandment of Itself

Did not redeem the father his son - whether intentionally, whether unintentionally, whether by force[16] - the son is commanded to redeem himself[17], when he grows up[18], and brings two hairs[19], as it is said: “redeem you shall redeem”[20], and the scripture is read “you shall redeem” - to

redeem others[21] - and in any case, it is also to be read “you shall be redeemed” - to redeem yourself[22] - and we have learned that he is obligated to redeem himself[23].

And there are those who explained that one should not read the text “ti-padeh” - in their opinion, where the scripture and the tradition are equal, one does not expound the tradition[24] - but the very meaning of the text “ti-fdeh” includes both that he redeems others, meaning the father his son, and that he redeems himself[25].

And in the Jerusalem Talmud they expounded, it is said: “A man, etc. you shall redeem”[26], that he is obligated to redeem himself[27], and the later ones explained, that since in the verse “And every firstborn of man among your sons you shall redeem” the word “man” is superfluous, they expounded that every firstborn, the man himself, or among your sons, you shall redeem[28].

And in the Mekhilta they said, it is stated: “And every firstborn of my sons I will redeem”[29], that if his father did not redeem him, he redeems himself[30]. Rabbi Yose the Galilean says, since the Torah said regarding Torah study* and circumcision*, which are the commandments of the son imposed on the father[31], that if his father did not teach him and circumcise him, he teaches and circumcises himself[32], we learn - by a general principle* - that also the redemption of the son, which is the commandment of the son imposed on the father, if his father did not redeem him, he redeems himself[33].

And from the later ones, there are those who wrote that it is customary - for a firstborn whose father died before he redeemed him[34] - to write on a silver plate that he is not redeemed and to hang it on his neck, so that he will know to redeem himself when he grows up[35].

Court

Court*, even though they are commanded to circumcise a son when his father did not circumcise him[36], early authorities wrote that they are not commanded to redeem him[37], for it is not stated in the scripture that the court is obligated in the redemption of the son[38].

And from the later ones, there are those who wrote the reason, that since the commandment of the redemption of the firstborn involves a financial loss, the court is not commanded in it[39].

And there are early authorities who wrote that whenever the father dies while he has not yet redeemed his son, the court is obligated to redeem him[40].

And from the later ones there are those who wrote, that when the father does not redeem, the court redeems from the public funds, and it is a commandment in itself imposed upon them[41].

On the redemption of the firstborn done by a court, if it is effective, and if it is appropriate to do so, see below.

The commandment of the father when the son has grown

Even after when the son grows up, that he is obligated to redeem himself[42], the early authorities wrote that the father is still obligated in the redemption of his son[43], for the Torah did not give a time for his obligation[44], and the Torah said: And every firstborn of man among your sons you shall redeem[45], thus it imposed the commandment on the father[46], and even an adult son is still considered a son[47], and whoever precedes to redeem has merited, for the commandment is imposed on both of them[48], however, the father precedes, for the commandment of the son is upon the father[49].

And there are early authorities that it appears from their words that once the son has grown, the commandment of redemption is incumbent only upon him[50].

And in the explanation of their opinion, there are those who wrote that initially the commandment of the redemption of the firstborn is imposed on the son, but since the minor cannot redeem himself, the father is appointed by the Torah to be the son’s agent to redeem him. Therefore, when the son grows up and becomes capable of redeeming himself, the agency of the father ceases[51]. Later authorities rejected their words, stating that the father is not the son’s agent. Nevertheless, since the commandment for a person to redeem himself precedes the commandment of his father to redeem him[52], once the son becomes obligated, the father’s commandment ceases[53].

After the death of the firstborn

The father is obligated in the redemption of his son even after death, that if the son dies after thirty days, since he is already obligated in redemption[54], the father redeems him after death[55], for it is a debt that the scripture imposed on the father[56], as it is expounded in the Mekhilta: “And all the firstborn of my sons I will redeem”[57], even after death[58], and in the Talmud, Resh Lakish expounded by a verbal analogy*, “valuation” “valuation” from valuations*[59] - it is stated here: “And his redemption from a month old you shall redeem according to your valuation”[60], and it is stated in valuations: “your valuation”[61] - just as

valuations, one who says “my valuation is upon me,” even if he dies, his heirs are obligated in his valuation[62], so too the redemption of the son, if the son dies after thirty days, his father is obligated in his redemption[63], and Rav Dimi in the name of Rabbi Yonatan expounded, it is stated here: “All the firstborn of your sons you shall redeem and they shall not appear before me empty-handed”[64], and we learn “empty-handed” “empty-handed” from the burnt offering of appearance*[65] - as it is stated regarding it: “and they shall not appear before me empty-handed”[66] - just as the burnt offering of appearance, the heirs are obligated in it after death[67], so too the redemption of a firstborn who died, his father is obligated in it[68], and so too the heirs, after the father and the firstborn have died[69].

And so, if the firstborn died after he matured and was not redeemed, since he became obligated in the commandment before he died, his heirs are obligated in his redemption[70].

In the matter of the redemption after the son has died, the Rishonim disagreed: some hold that even though it is a mitzvah[71], nevertheless it is not like the regular redemption of the son, but only as the payment of a debt[72] - and therefore no blessing is recited over it[73] - and from the words of many Rishonim - who hold that a blessing is recited over it[74] - it appears that it is indeed a redemption like any other redemption of the son[75].

And from the later authorities, there are those who wrote that there is no obligation of the commandment of redemption after death at all, but rather a lien remains due to the commandment that existed while the son was alive, and by fulfilling the lien, the commandment that was [76] is fulfilled. And they wrote for this reason that if the father was a fool*, exempt from the commandments [77], from the time the son became thirty days old until he died, and he recovered afterwards, since he was not obligated in the commandment while the son was alive, he is not obligated in the redemption of the son after his death [78].

Obligation of the Father

In the matter of the redemption of the firstborn by the father, among the early authorities, there are those who wrote that the main commandment is on the son to redeem himself, but since it is not possible to obligate the son in his childhood, the Torah imposed the commandment on his father[79].

And later authorities explained in their opinion, that the commandment of redemption is the commandment of the son, but the Torah obligated the father to perform the duty of his son[80]. And there are later authorities who hold that the commandment of redemption upon the father is the duty of the father[81].

And there are among the later authorities who wrote that the commandment of the father to redeem his son and the commandment of the son to redeem himself are two obligations, and they are distinct from one another, for the commandment of the father is to redeem, and the commandment of the son is that he be redeemed - and his act of redemption is merely like paying a debt[82] - and the reason the son is exempt when his father redeems him is because his commandment is that he be redeemed, and when the father redeems him, his commandment is fulfilled automatically[83].

The Commandment of Education

Firstborn whose father did not redeem him, and he is still a minor*, even though he has reached the age of minors*, whose sale is a sale and whose gift is a gift[84], later authorities wrote in the opinion of earlier authorities that he is not obligated, due to the commandment of education* to redeem himself[85], and later authorities wrote the reason, that the sages did not obligate a minor due to education except in commandments that he can return and fulfill when he grows up, but the commandment of redeeming the son that if he fulfills it now he will not be able to return and fulfill it, the sages did not say that he should fulfill it and lose his commandment when he grows up[86].

And there are those who wrote - in their opinion that the obligation of the redemption of the firstborn does not apply at all to a minor[87] - that education is not relevant in the commandment of the redemption of the firstborn, because since the obligation does not exist until the son grows up, there is no fulfillment of the commandment in the redemption at all[88].

And there are later authorities who wrote that if the father is alive, even though he does not redeem his son, the son is forbidden to redeem himself and nullify the father’s commandment to redeem him, because every day it can be said that the father will still fulfill his commandment and redeem him before he grows up. But if the father has died, the son is obligated to redeem himself due to the commandment of education, once he reaches the age of minors[89].

The Commandment of the Priest

The priest who receives the redemption of the firstborn, later authorities wrote that he fulfills a commandment[90].

And from the words of the Rishonim it appears that there is no mitzvah at all for the Kohen[91], and so wrote the Acharonim, and they wrote for this reason that even a Kohen who is an onen, who is exempt from the mitzvot[92], it is possible to give him the redemption of the firstborn[93].

Place of Obligation

The commandment of the redemption of the firstborn applies in every place[94], both in the Land and outside the Land[95], for every commandment that is an obligation of the body applies both in the Land and outside the Land[96].

Time of Obligation

The commandment of the redemption of the firstborn applies at all times[97], both in the presence of the Temple and not in the presence of the Temple[98].

Benefit from the Firstborn

Firstborn of a human*, even though it requires redemption, it is permitted for benefit[99], for his handiwork is permitted even before the redemption[100], as it is said: You shall not work with the firstborn of your ox[101], but you may work with the firstborn of a human[102], for his handiwork is permitted[103].

Renewed Obligation at All Times

The obligation of the redemption of the firstborn, there are those who wrote in the opinion of the early authorities that a new obligation is added at all times, and as if an obligation upon an obligation is imposed[104], for the Torah warns him about this every day, and as if a new debt document is written upon him every day to obligate him in the redemption of the firstborn[105].

The Time

Time of Obligation Occurrence

Beginning of the time of obligation for the redemption of the firstborn is when the firstborn completes thirty days[106] - that he exits the category of a stillborn* [107] - as it is said: “And those to be redeemed from a month old you shall redeem”[108].

It was known to us about the firstborn that he is not a miscarriage, there are early authorities from whose words it appears that he is obligated in redemption even before thirty days[109].

And many of the early authorities wrote that even when it is known that it is not a miscarriage, the firstborn is not obligated in redemption before reaching thirty days, for thus is the decree of the scripture[110].

The thirtieth day itself, if the firstborn is obligated in redemption, the Tannaim disagreed: The Sages say, the thirtieth day is like the day before it, and the firstborn is not yet obligated in redemption[111], as it is stated in the redemption of firstborns in the wilderness: Count every firstborn male of the children of Israel from a month old and above[112] - and “and above” implies after thirty[113] - and we learn by a verbal analogy* for the redemption of firstborns of generations, as it is stated: And those to be redeemed from a month old you shall redeem[114], that they are not obligated in redemption except after thirty[115].

And Rabbi Akiva is uncertain if the thirtieth day is like before it or like after it, as we find in valuations* that they needed to learn from a special derivation that the thirtieth day is like before it[116], and behold, the redemption of the firstborn of the wilderness and valuations are two verses that come as one*, which do not teach - according to those who hold so[117] - and in any case, it is possible that even though they do not teach other matters, they teach for the redemption of generations, as the redemption of generations and the redemption of the wilderness both deal with the firstborn, and therefore the thirtieth day is uncertain - and the one who wishes to extract from his fellow, upon him is the proof[118] - and if the son died on the thirtieth day, if the father already gave the redemption money to the priest, he should not take it, and if he did not give, he should not give[119].

The law is like the sages that the thirtieth day is like the day before it[120].

On the measure of the month according to the words of the sages, whether it depends on the thirty-first day specifically or on the measure of time of the renewal of the moon - which is 29 days and 12 hours and 793 parts[121] - from

time to time, see also month: month from time to time[122].

Stayed in an incubator

Firstborn that was born prematurely in a manner that from the beginning was not fit to live except by staying in an “incubator” completing its gestation period, that is obligated in redemption, according to those who hold so[123], the decisors are divided on when the beginning time of its redemption is, some say not to redeem it until thirty days have passed after its exit from the incubator, because since it was not fit to live on its own until its exit from the incubator, it turns out that its state upon exiting the incubator is like a regular newborn at birth, and the time of its redemption, which is when it exits the status of a stillborn*[124], is thirty days thereafter[125].

And there are those who wrote to redeem him after thirty days from his birth even while he is still in the incubator, and even though he is not yet able to live on his own, because anyone who could live thirty days by means of the incubator has been clarified that initially he was not considered a miscarriage, and behold he is generally a child who is redeemed after thirty days from his birth[126].

Time of Fulfillment

The commandment of redeeming the firstborn son has no fixed time, and at any hour once the son reaches thirty days, its time is [127]. If one delays, he only loses the optimal fulfillment of the commandment, which is on the thirtieth day [128]. In any case, the redemption is not postponed, as one should not delay a commandment, and the diligent hasten to perform commandments [129]. If he was not available to redeem him, he should redeem him at any time, and if he never redeems him, he remains in transgression [130]. For if the father dies before redeeming his son, he has nullified the commandment of redeeming the firstborn son and bears guilt upon his soul [131]. However, delaying the redemption is not a nullification of the commandment [132].

And there are those who appear from their words that the day on which the firstborn becomes fit for redemption, is the time of its redemption, and if the redemption is postponed afterwards, they can postpone it further[133].

And there are early authorities who wrote that once the father becomes obligated in the redemption of his son, he transgresses it every day - and every hour[134] - in a positive commandment[135].

And there are later authorities who wrote that within the thirty-first day itself, which is the day he becomes obligated in redemption[136], there is no deficiency in delaying the redemption from the beginning of the day to its end, but from the thirty-first day and onward he transgresses it[137].

From the early ones, there are those who wrote that it was customary to delay the redemption[138] and generally, they do not redeem in its time[139] - and therefore add a fifth to the money[140] - and it appears from their words that they were accustomed to delay even until the wedding of the firstborn[141].

On “do not delay”* if it applies to the redemption of the firstborn, see there[142].

When its time is on Shabbat

If the thirty-first day falls on Shabbat, the early authorities wrote that one redeems after Shabbat on the thirty-second day[143], because redemption on Shabbat is forbidden due to buying and selling[144]. To redeem before Shabbat in a manner that the redemption occurs in its time on Shabbat[145], there is doubt regarding the blessings[146]. Similarly, the redemption meal - which is customary to make a meal to publicize the mitzvah[147] - cannot be made before Shabbat according to those who hold that the mitzvah has not yet been fulfilled[148]. And if they make it on Shabbat, when the mitzvah is fulfilled, nevertheless, since they do not see the redemption at the time of the meal, it is possible that there is no publicity for the mitzvah. Therefore, it is preferable to postpone after Shabbat, for even though it is not proper to postpone the redemption[149], in order to fulfill the mitzvah properly, with fitness and enhancement, they postpone[150].

And there are those who wrote that even because of buying and selling it is forbidden to do from the eve of Shabbat so that the redemption will occur on Shabbat[151]. And there are those who wrote to redeem on the eve of Shabbat, and even the meal that they make on the eve of Shabbat has in it the publicity of the mitzvah[152].

And there are those who redeemed on the eve of Shabbat and made the meal on Shabbat[153]. And there are those who redeemed on Shabbat[154].

And there are those who wrote, that if twenty-nine days and twelve hours and 793 parts have passed from the time of birth on the thirtieth day, which is the eve of Shabbat, they shall redeem on the thirtieth day - according to their opinion that the main time for the redemption of the son is after twenty-nine days, twelve hours, and 793 parts from the time of birth, even within the thirtieth day[155] - and if not, they shall redeem after Shabbat[156].

If the thirty-first day falls on the first day of Rosh Hashanah, if they postpone the redemption it will be postponed until after the two days of Rosh Hashanah and the Fast of Gedaliah - in order to make a meal with the redemption[157], according to those who hold that one does not redeem on the night before the fast even after the thirty-first day[158] - there are later authorities who wrote that it is preferable to advance it to the eve of Rosh Hashanah - and make a meal on that day, even though it is customary to fast on the eve of Rosh Hashanah[159], since it is only a custom[160] - and to stipulate that it will take effect in its time on the thirty-first day[161].

At night

Redemption of the firstborn is valid both by day and by night[162], and in any case, later authorities wrote that the custom is to perform the redemption only by day[163], but it is permissible to do it at night[164], and a support for this is that the redemption of the firstborn is because the firstborn of Israel were saved from the plague of the firstborn[165], and it occurred at midnight[166], and therefore from midnight onward it is certainly possible to perform it when there is a need, but without any reason, one should not deviate from the custom[167].

And there are those who are accustomed to perform the redemption on the night of the thirty-first day after the birth of the firstborn[168].

And there are those who wrote a reason to perform the redemption of the firstborn during the day, for there is in it the publicizing of the miracle of the plague of the firstborn, and during the day the miracle is publicized more[169].

And there are those who wrote the reason because of the meal - that they are accustomed to make it at the time of the redemption of the son[170] - that its commandment is during the day because the blind eats and is not satisfied, and they wrote that if they make the meal by the light of candles like the day, it is possible to redeem at night[171].

And the later authorities wrote that the redemption of the firstborn, whose initial time is the night before the fast, should be performed at night so that they can make a feast, and not redeem during the day and make the feast the following night. Nevertheless, they wrote that the custom is not so, but rather they redeem during the day and make the feast the following night[172].

And there are those who wrote the reason for the custom to perform the redemption on the thirty-first day after the birth of the firstborn, and not on the night before, to be concerned for the opinion of those who hold that even on the thirty-first day, if twenty-nine days, twelve hours, and 793 parts have not been

completed since the birth of the firstborn—which is the measure of the average lunar month[173]—the firstborn is not obligated in redemption[174]. And since sometimes the firstborn is born close to sunset, it turns out that twenty-nine, twelve, and 793 will not pass until the thirty-first day during the day, they customarily redeem always on the thirty-first day during the day[175]. And they wrote according to this, that if the redemption is postponed after the thirty-first day, it can also be done at night[176].

When the time for the redemption of the firstborn falls on Shabbat, which is postponed to after Shabbat, according to those who hold this view[177], later authorities wrote to perform the redemption on the night following Shabbat, and not to postpone it to the following day[178].

And there are those who wrote to postpone to the first day on the day[179], and there are those who wrote that this is the custom[180], and even when the first day is a fast, that it is impossible to hold the redemption meal on it, there are later authorities who wrote not to redeem on the night after Shabbat[181], and there are those who wrote when the first day is a fast, to redeem on the night after Shabbat[182].

When its time is on a fast day

Redemption of the firstborn when the thirty-first day from birth falls on a fast day, that if they do it in its time and during the day they cannot make a meal with it - as is customary[183] - there are later authorities who wrote, that if twenty-nine days and twelve hours and 793 parts have passed from the time of birth on the thirtieth day, which is the day before the fast, they should redeem on the thirtieth day - according to their opinion that the main time for the redemption of the firstborn is after twenty-nine days, twelve hours, and 793 parts from the time of birth, even within the thirtieth day[184] - and if not, they should redeem on the night before the fast, but not redeem on the fast day and make the meal on the night after it, because in a manner where the meal is not with the redemption it does not publicize the commandment, however, they wrote that the custom is not so but to redeem on the fast day and make the meal on the night after it[185], and in their opinion, some wrote that in a place where there is no custom, one should redeem on the night before the fast, and if it is the ninth of Av, when it is not possible to make a meal even on its night, they should do the redemption and the meal at the end of the fast[186].

And there are those who wrote - in their opinion that one should not redeem before the thirty-first day[187] - that one always redeems on the fast day and holds the feast on the night following it[188].

And there are those who wrote to perform the redemption on the day close to evening, and to attach to it the meal immediately at the beginning of the night[189].

And there are those who wrote to redeem at night before the fast[190], and some of them wrote that it is on the condition that already passed at night 29 12 793 to the birth of the firstborn, but if they have not yet passed, they should not do at night[191].

And there are those who wrote to do both the redemption and the meal on the night after the fast[192]. And there are those whose words seem to postpone the redemption to the day after the fast[193].

While he was not circumcised

The time has come for the son to be redeemed while he is not circumcised, such as when he is ill and cannot be circumcised[194]. Later authorities have written that the redemption is not postponed until after the circumcision, but rather he is redeemed at his time[195], as circumcision does not prevent redemption, just as it does not prevent a person from being obligated in the fulfillment of all commandments[196]. A hint to this is that the firstborn of the Israelites in the desert were not circumcised - for all forty years that the Israelites were in the desert they did not circumcise[197] - and nevertheless, they were obligated in redemption[198].

And there are those who brought someone who instructed to postpone the redemption until after the circumcision[199].

The son becomes eligible for circumcision on the day his time for redemption arrives, later authorities wrote that circumcision should precede redemption, and even though redemption is in its time and circumcision not in its time, and a commandment in its time takes precedence[200], since circumcision is the sign of entering the religion and accepting the yoke of His kingdom, and without accepting the covenant there is no obligation for the commandment of redemption at all, it should be prioritized and not redeem the son while he is still uncircumcised[201], and even though circumcision does not prevent redemption[202], since it is only a matter of advancing circumcision by a short time, and ultimately fulfilling the redemption in its time, circumcision takes precedence[203].

And there are those who wrote to precede the redemption which is in its time, for a commandment is beloved in its time*[204].

Redemption before its time

The one who redeems his son, while the time for redemption has not yet arrived - regarding the time of redemption, see above[205] - if he said “from now” - meaning that the son will be redeemed from now[206], that the redemption will take effect immediately[207] - his son is not redeemed[208], but the redemption money is only a gift, for while the time has not yet arrived, redemption is not applicable[209].

And there are those who inclined towards the opinion of the Amoraim that the money is a deposit in the hands of the priest, and if it will be intact when the time of redemption arrives, the redemption will take effect with it[210].

He said “after thirty” - and that is that the money should be in the hands of the priest from now and the redemption will take effect when the time arrives, after thirty days[211] - and the money was present when the time of redemption arrived, the son is redeemed[212], as if giving it to him when the time arrived[213].

He said “after thirty”, and the money was consumed - that they are not present[214] - before the time of redemption arrived, the Amoraim disagreed: Rav said, his son is redeemed[215], as it is like betrothing a woman from now and after a time, that even if the money was consumed within the time she is betrothed[216], and Shmuel said his son is not redeemed[217], and this is not like the betrothal of a woman, for he can betroth her now, and in the redemption of the son within its time he cannot redeem now[218], and it appears from the words of the later authorities, that according to Rav, the one who redeems from now and after thirty days fulfills his commandment immediately - even though the redemption does not take effect until the time arrives[219] - and according to Shmuel, the commandment is not fulfilled until the time arrives, and therefore whenever the money is not present the commandment of redemption is not fulfilled[220].

To the law, most Rishonim ruled like Rav - that the law is like him in prohibitions[221] - that the son is redeemed[222].

And there are early authorities who ruled, according to their version in the Talmud[223], that even though the law follows Rav in prohibitions, in the case of redeeming from now and after thirty and the money was consumed, the law follows Shmuel, that the son is not redeemed[224].

And the decisors ruled like Rav[225].

And there are those who wrote that since there are those who hold according to the law like Shmuel that even after the fact the son is not redeemed, all who redeemed from now and after thirty days and the money is not present, it is good to redeem him again[226], and without a blessing[227].

Redeemed from here and after thirty, and the priest returned the money to him before the time of redemption arrived, the later authorities wrote that his law is as if the money was consumed, and it is possible that all the more so, and therefore - according to their opinion, if the money was consumed that it is good to redeem again[228] - it is proper to redeem him again[229].

The redeemer within the time in general - and such as he thought that the time had already arrived[230] - there are those who wrote that according to all, his redemption is not valid unless the money was present when the time arrived[231].

And there are those who wrote that his law is like one who says from now and after thirty[232], and later authorities instructed to be concerned for their words, that if he redeems it again he should not bless on the redemption[233]. It is proper to say from now[234].

Redemption within the time[235].

The redeemer within the time, there are later authorities who wrote that he blesses[236].

And there are those who wrote that he cannot bless[237], since because he is not yet commanded, how can he say “and commanded us”[238], and even according to those who hold that even when the money is consumed within the time the redemption takes effect[239], in any case he is still not commanded[240], furthermore, since it is possible that the son is a miscarriage*[241], and even though the majority are not miscarriages, we do not follow the majority in monetary matters, it turns out that he is still not obligated, it is not appropriate for him to say “and commanded us”[242].

The Money

The redemption is in the holy shekel[243].

Even if he waited several years to redeem, the redemption price does not change and he redeems him with five selaim[244].

In the portion of Tzuri[245].

In silver and in equivalent value[246].

Addition of a Fifth

The Geonim wrote that the redeemer needs to add a fifth to the redemption, just as one who redeems consecrated property adds a fifth to it[247], and this is a fifth from within which is a sixth from without[248].

And the early ones were astonished at them, for the redemption money has a fixed number, and why would they add a fifth[249].

And there are those who wrote that it is a scribal error, that there is no additional fifth in the redemption of the firstborn[250], and so wrote the Geonim, that the redemption of the firstborn is not like the redemption of consecrated items, and the additional fifth does not apply to it[251].

And there are Geonim and Rishonim who wrote regarding one who did not redeem his son until thirty days had passed, that he adds a fifth to the redemption money[252]. And Acharonim were astonished at them, for the matter is strange for several reasons[253].

There are those who have the custom to add to the redemption money a silver vessel - and it is customary that the priest returns it after the redemption - that if the money is not sufficient, the priest will accept it as five selaim, and they will fulfill thereby[254].

A firstborn that has two heads, they redeem it with ten selaim, for the scripture has hung the redemption on the skull[255].

Desires to give it to a priest

The father wished to place the firstborn himself in the hands of the priest and not to redeem him, he is not exempt thereby from the redemption of the son[256], and later authorities wrote the reason, for indeed a human firstborn is completely non-sacred, and why is he needed for the priest, if to become his servant, a free man does not become a servant[257], and if to become his son, indeed he is not his offspring[258].

Redeem a girl a silver token and a gold token and rings of copper[259].

One does not redeem with land[260]. Rabbi says, with everything one redeems except for documents[261].

There is no redemption with slaves[262].

There is no redemption with documents[263].

Wrote to the priest: I owe you five selaim[264].

Giving a pledge to the hand of a priest for the redemption money, the later authorities wrote that it does not fulfill the redemption of the firstborn[265].

On the redemption of the firstborn as a gift-on-condition-to-return*, see there.

Lesson five sela, two golden reinos[266]. See also sela.

The one who sets aside money for the redemption of the son is liable for their responsibility[267],

Is it necessary that the money be of the redeemer[268].

The priest's waiver on the redemption of the firstborn does not help to exempt from redemption, for the Torah said to redeem him, and a waiver is not a redemption[269]. He knew to waive[270]. And even for the value of a perutah[271].

And even in a cup of wine or bread or garment[272].

When he redeemed with equivalent money and it was found that it is not worth five selaim[273]. Even though the priest returned the redemption amount, since there were not five selaim, the son is not redeemed[274].

Received the priest with five selaim. There are those who say that he is redeemed[275]. And there are those who say that if he is not an important person, he is not redeemed[276]. And even an important person, only with something that is worth to him specifically[277].

But he should not say that it is equal to him and it is not so, because the firstborn is not redeemed except with something whose value is five selaim[278]. And he cannot demand the object back, but he should add to the priest[279].

And there are those who differentiate if they received at the time of redemption even though he knew it was not five selaim, or afterwards he saw that it was not five selaim[280].

And there are those who say that it is only effective when the object is worth at least four sela[281]. The priest should do so only for the poor and recipients of charity[282].

If his intention was that the priest would return it to him, the son is not redeemed[283].

Even though the Israelite intended that he would return them to him, his son is redeemed, but it is not proper for the priest to do this, for if he sees that the Israelite intends that the priest return it to him, he should not return it to him, and also it is not proper to return except to the poor[284].

When he stipulated that the priest would receive less than five selaim[285]. If the priest receives them in five selaim, the son is redeemed[286]. And there are those who say he is not redeemed[287].

Redemption with a Loan

To redeem with a loan - such as when the priest owes him money and he forgives the debt for the redemption of his son - later authorities wrote that it is impossible[288], and even if the loan money is still intact[289], some wrote the reason is because the loan, when given, is meant for expenditure[290], and it turns out that now he is not giving the priest anything[291], and the redemption of the son, about which it is said: the firstborn of your sons you shall give to me[292], requires a strong giving, meaning the giving of actual money[293], and some inclined to explain the reason because one does not redeem with documents, whose essence is not money[294], and even the forgiveness of a loan, where he does not give the priest actual money, its essence is not money[295].

Even if he said to the priest that he wishes to redeem with the benefit of forgiving the loan[296], the later authorities wrote that the redemption is not effective, because even though benefit is considered as money - and is effective for sale and betrothal[297] - in the redemption of the firstborn which requires the measure of five selaim[298], the benefit is not considered as money in such a measure[299].

The Redemption

Gives it to the priest in every place[300].

The Essence of the Redemption

The commandment of the redemption of the firstborn, the early authorities wrote that it is not merely the giving to the priest, but includes the redemption that depends on it, and therefore, even though one does not bless on the commandment of giving priestly gifts* to the priests, according to those who hold so[301], the commandment of the redemption of the firstborn one blesses on it[302].

And so the later authorities explained in the opinion of the earlier authorities, that the redemption of the firstborn involves an act to redeem the firstborn from sanctity, and even though there are no laws proving that there is sanctity in a firstborn human before his redemption[303], nevertheless, since the Torah required to redeem him, it can be learned that the redemption renews in him the removal of some form of sanctity[304].

Whoever gave the redemption money to the priest, but thought that this was only a monetary obligation that the Torah obligated him to give to the priest because a firstborn was born to him, and did not understand that there is an act of redemption in this, there are some of the later authorities who inclined that he did not fulfill the obligation of the redemption of the firstborn[305].

The priest is a partner in the act of redemption[306].

Divided the redemption

Did not give the redemption money all at once but one after the other, he has fulfilled [307].

And even if he distributed the redemption money among several priests, he has fulfilled [308], since five selaim have left his hand to the priests for the redemption of his son, even though five selaim did not reach the hand of one priest [309].

And the early authorities disagreed regarding giving to several priests, some hold that he has not fulfilled his obligation unless he gave to all at once[310], such as placing five selaim before all of them and leaving[311], and some hold that even if he gave to several priests one after the other, he has fulfilled his obligation[312].

Initially, later authorities wrote that one should not divide the redemption, for whenever the Torah gave a measure, when dividing it, it is half a measure, and even though it combines, it is a preferred mitzvah to fulfill with a complete measure at once[313].

And there are those who hold that even initially it is possible to redeem from several priests and not all at once[314].

And there are those who wrote that to redeem at once from several priests is possible even ab initio, but to redeem one after the other is only post facto[315].

In giving this one after the other that he fulfilled, there are those who wrote the reason is because his intention from the beginning is to complete, and the money is a deposit in the hands of the priest until he completes, and therefore even if the first money was consumed before he completed, since if he does not complete the priest will need to return it to him, it is considered as giving all at once at the time he completes, and they wrote that for this reason in giving to several priests he does not fulfill unless he gave all at once, according to the opinion of those who hold so[316], because since his intention is not to complete for any one of them it is not all at once[317].

And there are later authorities from whose words it appears that even when the giver’s initial intention was not to complete, and when he came to complete, the first monies were already consumed, in any case, he has fulfilled [318].

And there are those who wrote in the opinion of the early authorities the reason they combine, because the redemption money does not prevent one another, in their opinion, and even if he only has part of the money, he should give it to the priest in order to fulfill part of the commandment, and therefore even when he gave the money one after the other, when he completed the redemption money, all that he gave combines for the fulfillment of the commandment[319].

And there are those who wrote the reason that they combine one after the other is because the main concern of the Torah is that the redeemer gives five selaim and that the priests benefit from them, and since the redeemer gave and the priests benefited, even if not all at once, and even if a long time passed between them, the commandment is fulfilled[320].

Gave to the priest part of the redemption money, and the priest returned it to him - for the return does not prevent the redemption[321] - and the redeemer returned and gave it to him, the later authorities were uncertain if they combine for the redemption of the son as the law of giving one after the other[322].

Giving to several priests, which is effective, there are later authorities who wrote that as long as he gives at once, even if each of them does not receive the value of a perutah, he has fulfilled [323], and there are those who wrote that he must give each one at least the value of a perutah [324], but a significant measure of giving to each one, later authorities wrote is not needed, as “giving” was not stated in the redemption of the firstborn [325], and there are those who wrote that there must be a significant measure of giving to each priest, and therefore, according to those who hold that giving is not less than a sela [326], the redemption money should not be divided except among five priests, each of whom will receive a sela [327].

In our time, when we have only “presumed priests”[328], there are those who have written that it is not proper to divide the redemption money among several priests, because it suffices that one of them is not a true priest to not fulfill the redemption[329].

The one who redeems himself, there are those among the later authorities who wrote - in their opinion, the redemption of a firstborn redeeming himself is a completed act and is not like the redemption of a father redeeming his son, which is an ongoing act[330] - that he only redeems all at once[331].

He to redeem and his son to redeem - such as he has only five selaim - the Tannaim disagreed what comes first: Tanna Kamma says he comes before his son, and Rabbi Yehuda says his son comes before him, for this is his commandment on his father and this is his son’s commandment on him[332].

Collection of the debt by the court[333], and even though it does not transfer the money to the priest, the redemption is valid[334].

And there are later authorities who wrote that the court cannot collect the redemption money of the firstborn from the father, for the redemption of the firstborn only takes effect when the father says at the time of giving, “I am giving this money for the redemption of my son,” and the court cannot say about money that is not theirs, “This is for the redemption of the firstborn,” but they compel the father until he redeems the son himself[335].

When collecting the redemption money of the firstborn from encumbered lands, the lands are not given to the priest, since as there is no redemption with lands, it turns out that the redemption of the firstborn is not fulfilled thereby, but rather the lands are sold and their money is given to the priest[336].

Separated the firstborns of his son and placed it in the window and it was lost, could it be that he is redeemed, the teaching says, it shall be yours and you shall surely redeem, that which is yours is redeemed, that which is not yours is not redeemed[337]. He is liable for its responsibility[338].

The early authorities disagreed whether the redemption is fulfilled by separation but he is liable for its responsibility, or there is no redemption except by giving to the hand of a priest[339].

A priest obligated in redemption

A priest obligated in the redemption of the firstborn, such as if he has a firstborn son who is a challal*, that he is obligated in his redemption[340], the early authorities wrote that he sets aside the redemption money - and says, “Behold, my son is redeemed with these five selaim”[341] - and keeps them for himself[342].

And there are those who wrote in the opinion of the Geonim, and so wrote the Rishonim, that since the father is a Kohen and entitled himself to the redemption of his son, he does not need to set aside any money for the redemption[343].

On a disqualified firstborn that his father did not redeem him, if he redeems himself, see firstborn of a person[344].

When the son is not with him

He can redeem the son even when the son is not with him[345].

On the section of the redemption of the firstborn, when there is no obligation to give it to the priest, see also firstborn of a person[346].

Grasp

A priest seized the redemption of the firstborn money from one obligated in them, the early authorities wrote that the seizure is effective, but it is forbidden to seize initially, as it is said regarding priestly gifts: and he shall give, and not that he shall

take by himself, however, all this is when the obligated wants to give to another priest, but if he does not want to give at all, that he is robbing the tribe, it is permitted to seize from him even initially[347].

The latter authorities wrote that his seizure does not help and the redemption does not take effect, and even according to those who hold that a priest who seized tithes and the like, his seizure is effective, and the owners cannot take it from him to give to another priest[348], as they only have the benefit of enjoyment*, and the benefit of enjoyment - according to the law, in their opinion - is not money[349], the redemption of the firstborn is not so, because as long as the redemption money has not reached the priest, it is entirely the owner's money, and the priests only have a lien on the assets of the one obligated in redemption, and therefore the obligated one can take it from the priest to give to another priest[350].

And there are those who wrote another reason that seizure does not help, that the seizure of the priest, since the redeemer did not say that he gives the money for the redemption of his son, it does not help for redemption with them, and consequently the priest cannot seize[351].

And there are later authorities who wrote in the opinion of earlier authorities that seizure is effective in the redemption of the firstborn[352].

Subjugation

The obligation of the redemption of the firstborn causes a lien on the debtor's property[353], for it is a complete debt[354], and therefore if the father dies after his firstborn son becomes thirty days old, having become obligated in his redemption, they collect the redemption from his property[355].

The obligation of the father's assets for the redemption of the son does not cease even after the son has grown and is obligated to redeem himself, and in any case, as long as the son can redeem, the early authorities wrote that they do not collect from the father's assets[356].

And from the later authorities, there are those who wrote that even if the son can redeem himself, the priests can collect the redemption money from the assets of each one of them, because the debt is imposed on each one of them individually[357].

Assets that came after the obligation of redemption

The enslavement began due to the obligation of the redemption of the firstborn, there are early authorities who wrote that it is like any property lien that does not include “daikni,” that it only applies to the assets that were in the hands of the obligor at the time the lien took effect[358], and therefore also in the redemption of the firstborn, the lien only applies to the assets that were in the hands of the obligor at the time the obligation of redemption took effect[359].

And there are early authorities who wrote that the lien applies also to assets acquired after the obligation of redemption has occurred, because at every moment the obligation of redemption rides upon it and a lien applies because of it[360], and it is considered as if at the time he acquired the assets the obligation applied to him[361], and it is found that the obligation applied after the assets were in his possession and the assets were encumbered[362].

The time of servitude on the son’s assets

The enslavement on the son’s assets, the early authorities wrote that it applies when the son becomes an adult and is obligated in the redemption of the firstborn[363]. And among the later authorities, there are those who wrote that there is an enslavement on the son’s assets even while he is still a minor[364].

Coercion

When the father does not want to redeem his son, the early and later authorities wrote that he is compelled to redeem [365], by seizing his assets, or by beating until his soul departs [366]. However, if the son has grown and the father did not redeem him, since the commandment is incumbent upon both, according to those who hold this view [367], the early authorities wrote that even though the father precedes in the commandment [368], as long as the son can redeem himself, the father is not compelled to redeem him [369]. Among the later authorities, some wrote that it is possible to compel both the father and the son [370].

And there are later authorities who disagree, that one does not compel a father to redeem his son, because since if the father does not redeem, the son is obligated to redeem himself when he grows up, it is as if the Torah gave the father the

option to remove the commandment from himself and leave it to his son[371], however, the son when he grows up, certainly they compel him to redeem himself[372].

Agent

The agent that the father appointed to redeem his son, the early and later authorities wrote that it is impossible to fulfill the redemption through him[373], for the commandment is primarily on the father, and it cannot be fulfilled through an agent[374]. The later authorities explained the reason, because the redemption is a commandment that the Torah imposed on him, like the laying of tefillin* and tzitzit* - which are commandments of his body and do not involve agency*[375] - and therefore it must be done by his body and not through an agent[376]. And there are those who wrote that since it is stated: you shall redeem[377], an agent is excluded, because the implication of the verse is you shall redeem yourself and not through an agent[378], or because it is stated: and every firstborn of man among your sons[379], and it is repeated again: and every firstborn of my sons[380], they learned that the father himself must redeem his son, and not an agent[381].

And so the son, when he grows up and becomes obligated to redeem himself, the early authorities wrote that he cannot perform the redemption through an agent[382].

And the early and later authorities disagree, that it is possible to redeem through an agent[383], since the redemption of the firstborn is not a personal obligation[384], and just as in all the Torah a person’s agent is like himself[385], so it is in the redemption of the firstborn[386], and nevertheless, it is a greater mitzvah for him than through his agent*, and therefore, whenever he can redeem himself without difficulty, he should not do it through an agent[387].

And there are those who gave a reason to perform the redemption of the firstborn himself more than other commandments, for indeed the plague of the firstborn in Egypt from which the firstborn of Israel were saved, it is said about it: "And I will pass through the land of Egypt, etc."[388], I and not a messenger[389], and it is fitting to make in the redemption of the firstborn a remembrance of the miracle[390].

And there are those who wrote that a firstborn redeeming himself can redeem himself through an agent, but a father redeeming his son cannot redeem through an agent, for the father himself is considered the agent of the son appointed by the Torah to redeem him, according to their opinion[391], and an agent appointed by the Torah does not appoint another agent[392].

The agent performed the redemption with the father's money, there are later authorities who wrote that the redemption is effective according to everyone[393], some of whom wrote the reason that the father is merely like one who places his money on the monkey and sends it to the priest, that it suffices for the priest to know that it was sent to him for redemption and the redemption is effective[394], and some of whom wrote the reason, in their opinion that a priest who seized the redemption money of the son against the father's will, his seizure was effective[395], since the priest received the money as redemption, the commandment was fulfilled even without the agency being effective for the father[396].

And there are those who wrote that even if the agent performed the redemption with his own money, the redemption is fulfilled even if agency is not effective - and even by one who is not fit to be an agent[397] - because since the priest received the money for the sake of redemption, the redemption takes effect[398].

And there are those who disagree, that if the father told the agent to perform the redemption on his behalf, even if the money is the father's, it is agency, and according to those who hold that there is no agency in the redemption of the son, the redemption is not effective[399].

Giving the money to the priest through an agent, when the father himself says to the priest, with this money that I transfer to you through the agent my son will be redeemed, the later authorities wrote that it is effective for redemption according to all opinions, as the agency is only for the transfer of the money, but the redemption is done by the father himself[400], and even if the money belongs to the agent, his giving is not agency for the redemption and it is effective according to all opinions[401].

And so if the father tells the agent to say to the priest that his friend is giving him the money for the redemption of his son, the later authorities wrote that the redemption is effective according to everyone, and even if the money belongs to the agent, since he does not say to him, "I am making you an agent to redeem, and when you give the money to the priest for the sake of redemption, your act will be as my act," this is not agency for the redemption[402].

To those who hold that it is possible to perform the redemption of the firstborn through an agent, if the agent can be a woman, or a priest or a Levite, who are themselves exempt from the redemption of the firstborn, see agency[403].

Redemption by Others

Court - or others - if they wish to redeem the firstborn, there are early and later authorities who wrote that they cannot redeem him[404], without the father[405].

And there are later authorities who wrote, that if the father is not here, others can redeem [406], and so wrote earlier authorities, that if others redeemed him without his knowledge, he is redeemed [407].

And there are those who differentiate, that as long as the father can redeem by himself, others cannot redeem without his permission, for the commandment to redeem is incumbent upon the father, and one cannot say “benefit for a person not in his presence,” for it is a detriment to the father who loses the reward of the commandment and the blessings. But if it is known that the father is poor and cannot redeem by himself at all, another is permitted to redeem, for it is a benefit to the father, and even if the father subsequently protests that he does not agree, they do not heed him[408].

And there are those who wrote that since it is possible to redeem through an agent, in their opinion[409], whenever the father does not redeem, or has died, the court can redeem on behalf of the son, for one can benefit a person in their absence, and even though the son can redeem himself when he grows up, redemption by others now is not an obligation for him, for who knows what the day will bring[410].

And there are those who wrote that the fulfillment of the commandment by others is never considered an obligation, even when the father is alive and can redeem, and for this reason, when the father dies before the redemption, the court or others are permitted to redeem the son, because even though he is a minor and a minor cannot have agency[411], in a matter that is a complete merit for him and has no aspect of obligation, it is possible to grant him merit from the Torah[412] - according to those who hold that a minor can acquire merit from the Torah[413] - and the fulfillment of his commandment by another is not considered an aspect of obligation[414], especially since the minor gains money from this, as he will not need to redeem himself from his own funds[415] - and so it is proper to do, lest the son not know how to redeem himself when he grows up, and even though it is customary to hang a silver plate on him indicating he is obligated in redemption[416], most times the plate gets lost[417] - all the more so if they transfer the redemption money to the son and redeem with his money, the commandment is certainly done from his own, it is certainly a merit for him and they can do it for him, especially if the court is the one redeeming, as the court can grant merit to a minor even where there is an aspect of obligation[418].

And there are those who wrote an additional reason that others can redeem, that the commandment of the redemption of the firstborn is only a monetary obligation, for it is collected from encumbered properties[419], and one who pays the debt of his friend certainly the debt is paid, and the commandment is not imposed on the father except initially[420].

And there are those who wrote that during the father's lifetime, as long as the father is not present, others can become his agents and redeem, even with the agent's money, because even though this is not a complete merit for the father, as he might want to redeem himself, nevertheless it is a merit for him, and one can benefit a person not in his presence. But if the father died, and the commandment is only incumbent upon the son and he is a minor, others cannot redeem, because a minor, who has no agency, can only be benefited in something that is a complete merit. And since it is possible that the son would prefer to redeem himself when he grows up, it turns out that there is an aspect of obligation in the redemption, and it is sufficient that no one else can do it for him[421].

And there are those who wrote another reason that the court or others cannot redeem a minor whose father died before he was redeemed, since the minor is not of age of obligation, the commandment of redemption of the firstborn has not yet applied to him at all, and this is like redeeming before its time, which some say the redemption does not take effect[422].

And there are those who wrote that even if others can redeem the minor with their money, they cannot redeem him with his money, and likewise they cannot transfer money to him and redeem him with it, since he is not yet obligated to redeem himself[423], and even by the law of education he is not commanded to redeem himself[424], it is impossible to take from his money for that which he is not obligated in[425].

And there are those who wrote that redemption from the minor's money does not have merit for the minor, and it could only be effective by the law of agency, and since there is no agency for a minor, it is impossible to redeem him from his money[426].

And there are those who wrote that even from the wealth of an adult it is impossible to redeem without his knowledge, because perhaps he wishes to give the redemption to another priest, and it turns out that the redemption is not a benefit for him[427].

And there are those who argued the opposite, that from the minor's property it is certainly possible to redeem him, because the Torah granted the priest a portion in his assets for the fulfillment of the commandment of the redemption of the

firstborn, and it is therefore appropriate to collect from his assets the redemption money and give it to the priest[428].

To the law, many later authorities wrote, in a son whose father died before his redemption, or in a son of an Israelite woman who comes from a non-Jew, who has no father to redeem him, and needs redemption[429], that the court or others redeem him[430].

And there are those who have written in law that he should not be redeemed until he grows up and redeems himself[431]. And there are those who have written to redeem him by others, and in any case when he grows up he should return and redeem himself out of doubt[432].

Redemption of a Minor Himself

A minor firstborn who redeemed himself, if his redemption was effective so that he would not be obligated to redeem himself when he grows up, the later authorities were uncertain, as it is possible that since he is not yet of obligation age, the redemption was not effective, and it is possible that even though he is not yet of obligation age, nevertheless the obligation exists, and therefore when he redeemed himself in his minority, he is like orphans who paid a debt in their minority, that even though they are not obligated to pay, according to those who hold that paying a creditor is a commandment and minors are not obligated in it, nevertheless their payment was effective [433].

And there are those who it appears from their words that the redemption will not help[434].

The Priest

Redemption of the firstborn can be given to a female Kohen[435].

Redemption of the firstborn can be given to any priest[436], whether he is of the watch group* or not of the watch group[437]. Regarding giving the redemption of the firstborn to an ignorant priest*, see also priestly gifts.

On a minor priest, if it is possible to give him the redemption of the firstborn, see also priestly gifts.

Blind Kohen

A blind priest, permitted to redeem the firstborn[438] - even though he is blemished[439] - as it is said regarding priests: and they shall be holy[440], in their existence they shall be[441].

The Messenger of the Priest

Giving the money of the redemption of the firstborn into the hands of the priest's agent, to acquire them for him, there are those among the later authorities who wrote in the opinion of the earlier authorities that one does not fulfill the obligation of the redemption of the firstborn with this, for a person does not appoint an agent to receive a gift, according to their opinion[442], and even the receiving of the redemption of the firstborn is like receiving a gift and the priest cannot do it through an agent[443].

And there are later authorities who wrote that even though the giving to the hand of the agent benefits the priest with the money, nevertheless the commandment of the redemption of the firstborn is not fulfilled until the money reaches the hand of the priest, as they expounded: "and he shall give to the priest"[444], and not to his agent[445], and the redeemer is liable for the responsibility of the money until it reaches the hand of the priest[446].

And many later authorities wrote that the priest can receive the redemption of the firstborn money through an agent and the commandment is fulfilled thereby[447], and among them are those who explained that even according to those who hold that a person does not appoint an agent to receive a gift, the redemption of the firstborn which the Torah commanded to give to the priest is not like a gift, and the priest can appoint an agent to receive it[448].

And in any case, later authorities wrote that since the Geonim instituted in the text of the redemption of the firstborn that the priest should ask the redeemer what he prefers more[449], it implies that the priest also has power in the act of redemption, and therefore it should not be done through an agent[450].

To Merit to Serve

To merit to give the redemption money through another, when the priest is not before us, there are some of the later authorities who wrote that one does not fulfill thereby the redemption of the son, for this is like crediting the payment of

his debt to the lender through another, that even though the Amoraim disagreed whether he can retract, in any case, according to all opinions, the borrower is not exempt from the responsibility of the money until it reaches the lender's hand[451], and since the redeemer is responsible for the money, the commandment of the redemption of the son has not yet been fulfilled[452].

And there are those who wrote another reason that it is impossible to acquire the redemption money through another, since the priest fulfills a commandment by receiving the redemption of the firstborn, in their opinion[453], and a commandment is better fulfilled by oneself than by one's messenger*, sometimes he does not wish for them to acquire on his behalf without his knowledge[454].

And many later authorities wrote that it is possible to fulfill the redemption of the firstborn by the priest acquiring through another[455], some of whom wrote that the redeemer is thereby exempt from the responsibility of the money even before it reaches the priest's hand, and this is not like paying a debt by acquisition through another where one is not exempt from responsibility, because in the payment of a debt, it is convenient for the lender that the money remains the borrower's responsibility until it reaches his hands, and therefore he does not want to acquire it, but in the redemption of the firstborn, since there are no claimants and it can be given to any priest, the priest wants to acquire it immediately so that the redemption is not given to another priest, and since he acquired it and the money became the priest's property, the commandment is fulfilled[456]. And some wrote that even though the redeemer is not exempt from responsibility, nevertheless, since he cannot retract, as in the payment of a debt, according to those who hold this view and the law is like them[457], the commandment of the redemption of the firstborn is fulfilled[458]. And some wrote that the responsibility that the redeemer is obligated in after the priest acquired the money is not on the commandment of redemption, but that after the commandment of redemption is fulfilled, the redeemer is still obligated in the responsibility of the money as with any property deposited in his hand, and therefore the responsibility does not impede the fulfillment of the commandment[459]. And some inclined that if indeed the priest ultimately did not consent to receive the redemption, or if the money was lost before it reached the priest's hand, the redeemer did not fulfill his obligation, but if the money reached the priest's hand and he consented to receive it, it is retroactively clarified that the acquisition by the acquirer was effective for him and the commandment of the redemption of the firstborn was fulfilled retroactively from the time of acquisition[460].

The commandment of the redemption of the firstborn that is fulfilled by acquisition through another, according to those who hold so[461], later authorities wrote that it is fulfilled even though the priest who is not here does not intend to transfer ownership of the son in exchange for the redemption, because the redemption of the firstborn is not like a sale and it is not necessary for the priest to intend to transfer ownership[462].

On those who hold that a priest cannot appoint an agent to receive the redemption of the firstborn - and all the more so that it is impossible to acquire for him through another without his knowledge - see above[463].

If it is necessary that the one acquiring the redemption money for the priest be himself a priest, who is fit to acquire for himself, see “one may acquire for a person not in his presence”[464].

A priest who is not clarified

In this time, when we have only “presumed priests”[465], there are later authorities who wrote, according to those who hold that it is possible to transfer the redemption money to a priest through another[466], that one who wishes to perform the redemption of the firstborn in a meticulous manner should transfer the redemption money through another to the true priests wherever they are[467].

And there are those who have the custom, to give the redemption money before many priests, and to say that the redemption is given to whoever among them is a true priest, and afterwards they all divide it among themselves[468].

And there are those who disagree, that it is impossible to fulfill the redemption of the firstborn by granting the money to an unclarified priest, and they wrote that when given in the presence of several priests, so that one of them who is a true priest may acquire it, the obligation of the redemption is not fulfilled, because since it is possible that each one of them may not have acquired it, and before us it is not clarified who acquired it, it turns out that none of them acquired it completely, as the others prevent him, and such acquisition is not sufficient for fulfilling the redemption[469].

The Blessings

When the son dies after thirty days, that the father is obligated in his redemption[470], the early authorities disagreed whether to bless on the redemption: the opinion of many early authorities is that they bless on it, like any redemption of the son[471], and there are early authorities who wrote, in their opinion, that this redemption is not like any redemption of the son but only as a debt payment[472], that they do not bless on it[473].

In the wording of the blessing, there are early authorities who wrote that one does not bless “on the redemption of the son” or “on the redemption of the firstborn”, as with any redemption[474], since from this wording it sounds as if the son is alive, but rather blesses “on the redemption of the firstborn of Israel”[475].

The blessing of Shehecheyanu at the time of redemption, the opinion of many Rishonim is that one does not bless[476], because the redemption reminds of the sorrow of the infant’s death[477], and this is not preferable over circumcision where Shehecheyanu is not blessed, because there is sorrow for the infant, according to those who hold this[478], for there is no greater sorrow for the infant than this[479], and there are those who inclined that one does bless, since he merits to fulfill the commandment[480].

To the law, they bless on redemption of the son who died the blessing of redemption of the son, and they do not bless Shehecheyanu[481].

One blesses “Shehecheyanu,” and there are early authorities who explained the reason that even though the commandment of redeeming the firstborn does not occur from time to time, nevertheless it is dependent on time, as one does not redeem the son until he reaches thirty days[482].

There are those who hold that one recites “Shehechiyanu” at the time of the circumcision of a firstborn son, who is destined to be redeemed, and not at the time of the redemption[483].

And there are those who disagree and hold that even one who recited “Shehecheyanu” at the time of the circumcision recites it again at the time of the redemption[484].

Also one who has already redeemed his son, and a firstborn son is born to him from another woman, he blesses “Shehecheyanu” at the time of his redemption[485].

Reason that the priest does not bless Shehecheyanu[486].

When the father does not bless “Shehecheyanu,” if the priest blesses[487].

If the father did not redeem his son and the son did not redeem himself, that they redeem from the father’s estate after his death[488], there are those who wrote that the heirs do not bless on the redemption[489].

The Customs of the Redemption

Meal

They are accustomed to make a meal for the redemption of the son[490], for the publicizing of the commandment[491].

And they perform the redemption after they have sat to dine and have blessed the blessing of “Hamotzi”[492], for if they have already redeemed him, the matter is not so publicized[493], but the main meal is made after the redemption, as it only comes for the sake of the redemption[494], and once they have eaten the blessing of “Hamotzi” they should not eat or drink at all until after the redemption[495], for if they make the meal before the redemption, it will not be a meal of mitzvah[496].

And there are those who say that they should wash their hands for the meal after the redemption[497].

And there are early authorities who wrote that one does not make a meal for the redemption of the firstborn except for one who desires[498], and the matter depends on the generosity of the father’s heart if he wishes to make a celebration for the arrival of his son to redemption and fulfilling his commandment, and one who does and has a generous spirit, blessing shall come upon him[499].

And there are those who wrote that it is proper that one should not make a feast except one who has the means to give the priest all the redemption money and also to make a feast, and not like those who make a feast and because of this condition with the priest to redeem for less than five selaim[500].

And there are those who redeemed the son in place of drinking without eating[501]. If the redemption meal is considered a mitzvah meal*, see there.

On the meal of the redemption of the firstborn on a festival, if there is in it the matter of “one does not mix joy with joy”*, see further[502].

Meal at the Redemption of the Firstborn Son

Even in the redemption of a son who died, there are those who wrote that a meal is made[503], provided that they redeem after the thirty days of mourning have passed[504].

The Status of Ten

Order of Redemption of the Firstborn, it is not necessary to perform it with ten [505], and it suffices to perform it in the presence of the priest [506] - and it is not similar to the law of a person who vowed “my value upon me” to the sanctuary* [507], which requires ten people to assess his value [508], for the redemption of the firstborn is fixed at five selaim [509], and does not require assessment [510] - but if one wishes to perform it with ten for honor alone, or to publicize the matter, or for the honor of the blessings, he is permitted [511], and it is customary for the enhancement of the commandment to perform it with ten [512].

And there are those who wrote that ten are required, and the priest and the father of the son are included in the count, and one should strive for this with all his might, and if it is impossible to bring ten to the firstborn or the firstborn to ten, he should redeem with ten not in the presence of the firstborn, and in any case, this does not prevent, and when there are not ten, he should redeem not with ten and not delay the commandment[513].

Amidah

Father of the son stands before the priest and the priest sits[514], as a sign of importance, as it is said regarding priestly gifts: for anointment[515], and this is a way of greatness[516].

And there are those who wrote that both should stand, due to the greatness of the commandment and its endearment, and it is not the honor of the commandment that one should stand and one should sit[517].

Giving the Firstborn to the Priest

Regularly they give the firstborn before the redemption into the lap of the priest[518], or into his hand[519] - and there are those who wrote that the priest stands and takes the firstborn from the father with both his hands and then sits back down[520] - and they do so for the honor of the priest and the honor of the commandment[521], and this custom is fundamental[522].

And there are those who wrote that the priest takes the firstborn in his cradle as one who takes his own[523]. And there are those who wrote that the father brings the firstborn before the priest to redeem him[524], and it appears from

their words that he does not place him in his lap[525].

And later authorities explained that even though it is possible to redeem the son not in his presence[526], nevertheless, initially it is a mitzvah to bring him before the priest so that it will be publicized that he blesses only for the redemption of this son[527].

And there are those who wrote that the father holds the son in his hands at the time of the redemption and stands opposite the priest and says, my wife bore me a male son, the firstborn of the womb, and behold he is yours[528].

And there are those who do not practice at all to bring the firstborn to the priest, and they redeem him wherever he is, except that the father says to the priest, my son so-and-so - and mentions his name[529] - the firstborn whom my wife bore to me, behold he is yours because he is my firstborn son[530], and he gives him to the priest as a gift[531], and he needs to say “my firstborn”, meaning, the beginning of my strength, and if he is the firstborn to his mother and not to his father, he says “firstborn”[532].

And so when the firstborn is not there and the father redeems him from his place, there are those who wrote that the father says, my wife so-and-so bore me a son so-and-so the firstborn and I give him to you, and the priest asks, will you give him to me wherever he is, and the father says, yes[533].

And there are those who wrote when the firstborn is not there, that it is sufficient for the father to inform the priest that he has a firstborn to redeem him[534].

Wrapping the Firstborn

When they bring the firstborn before the priest, it is customary that the father brings him wrapped in fine clothes according to his means[535].

Participation of the Mother

If there is to the firstborn a mother, there are those who wrote that she also comes with him[536].

Clarification of the Firstborn

The priest asks him if the son is a firstborn and the opener of the womb of his mother, and the father says, I know regarding this son of mine that he is a firstborn and the opener of the womb of his mother, and I am obligated to redeem him immediately to a priest as it is written “Every firstborn of your sons you shall redeem”[537], and the priest responds, You are as trustworthy regarding him as a hundred witnesses[538].

And a firstborn who redeems himself, the priest asks him if he is a firstborn and the opener of the womb, and he replies, thus I heard from my father or from witnesses that I am a firstborn and the opener of the womb, and if the father is there, the priest asks the father and he testifies about him[539].

And one who redeems his firstborn son who died, comes to the priest and informs him, and he asks him if he knows that he was a firstborn and the opener of the womb, and when it becomes clear to him thus, he gives the redemption to the priest for the sake of the firstborn who is in the grave[540].

And there are those who did not include in the redemption formula that the priest asks the father if his son is a firstborn, but wrote that the father informs the priest - in a loud voice[541] - that the son is a firstborn who opens the womb[542], and even according to those who hold that he places him in the priest’s lap[543], he must say this to him[544].

And there are those who wrote the text of the announcement, “My Israelite wife bore me this firstborn son[545].”

And so there are those who wrote about a firstborn whose father died and redeems himself, that he says to the priest, I am a firstborn who opened the womb, and the Holy One, blessed be He, commanded to redeem the firstborn, and due to my sins my father died before the time of my redemption, and I remained obligated to redeem myself, as it is written “the firstborn of your sons you shall redeem,” and it is read “you shall be redeemed,” meaning to say that I redeem myself, and behold I am ready to fulfill the commandment of the name[546].

And there are those who wrote that the priest asks the mother before the redemption if this is her firstborn [547], and some of them wrote that he asks her in this manner: Is this your firstborn son who opened the doors of your womb, or perhaps you miscarried before this a fetus and opened the doors of your womb and this is not a firstborn? And she answers: This is my firstborn son who opened the doors of my womb, and I did not miscarry before this, neither a child nor a fetus [548].

And there are those who wrote that after the act of redemption, the priest asks the mother if she did not miscarry or give birth to another son before this[549].

And there are those who say that there is no need to ask at all neither the father nor the mother, for if he is not a firstborn they would not redeem him[550].

The Question of Preference

There are those who wrote that the priest asks the father, in what do you desire more, in your firstborn son this or in the five selaim that you are obligated to redeem him with, and the father replies, my firstborn son I desire more, and behold, here are five selaim for his redemption[551].

And some of them have written that at the time the priest asks the father what is more dear to him, he raises both his hands and places them on the head of the firstborn, and they wrote that the father responds, my son is dear to me and I redeem him and redeem him, twice, because it is written “you shall surely redeem” [552], and it is written “and those to be redeemed from a month old you shall redeem” [553], redeemed twice - and this is because the scripture repeats “you shall surely redeem” and also because “and those to be redeemed” is written in the plural, we learn that two redemptions are included in the redemption of the firstborn - one from the Holy One, blessed be He, and one from the Angel of Death, and for this I redeem him with five shekels as the commandment of the Omnipresent, as it is said “and all the firstborn of my sons I redeem” [554], and it is written “every firstborn of your sons you shall redeem” [555].

In the firstborn redeeming himself, the priest asks, “What do you prefer, yourself or the five selaim that they obligated you in your redemption?” And the firstborn replies, "Myself, and here are five selaim for you."[556].

And the father and the priest need to understand what they are saying and what is being said to them[557]. And there are those who have written that they do not practice the formula of the preference question and the answer[558].

And there are those who have instituted that the priest should say, “Do you wish to redeem this your son for five shekels as it is written in the Torah?” And the father shall say, "Yes."[559].

The text:
The wording of the question and the answer, there are those who wrote to say it after the act of redemption, and after the blessing “Who sanctified”[560], before the priest says the wording of the exchange and blesses the firstborn[561].

And there are those who wrote that after the blessings of the redemption, the father places the redemption coins before the priest, and the priest asks him the preference question and the father answers, and afterwards the priest takes the coins and returns the son to his father[562].

In the father who redeems his son who died after thirty days, the father says, my firstborn son whom my wife bore to me died and left life to all Israel, here are five selaim that I was obligated to give to the priest for his redemption[563].

The Intent of the Question and the Answer

On the wording of the preference question and the answer, later authorities wondered, since if the father agrees to let the son serve the priest, the commandment of the redemption of the firstborn will not be fulfilled[564], how does the priest ask him if he desires this or the redemption of his son[565].

And there are those who wrote that the formula is only to endear the redemption to the father so that he will give the money willingly and not out of coercion[566].

And there are those who wrote that it is in order to clarify and publicize that he gives the money as a complete gift, and not with the intention that the priest will return it to him - for if so, his son is not redeemed[567] - and this is why they say to him, “What do you prefer more?” Meaning, if you prefer the five selaim and your intention is that the priest will return them to you, then your son is not redeemed and he is holy to the Lord as at the time he was born. And the redeemer responds, “I prefer my son more, and here are the five selaim for his redemption,” meaning that I give them as a complete gift so that my son will be redeemed[568].

And there are those who argued that therefore they practiced in the format of the question and answer, so that the father would understand that the redemption of the son is not merely a giving that the Torah obligated him to give to the priest because a firstborn was born to him - for if that is his intention, it is possible that the son is not redeemed[569] - but rather there is an act of redemption in this[570].

Bringing the Money in a Vessel

The money given for the redemption of the firstborn, there are those who wrote that they are placed in a silver cup or bowl[571], and they give the vessel with the money to the priest[572].

And there are those who wrote the reason, because the silver coins are mixed with much copper, and if they alone do not have the measure of the redemption of the son, the vessel will complete the measure[573].

Indeed, they wrote that the priest does not take the vessel but rather the money[574].

And there are those who wrote that the father places the vessel with the coins on the table before the priest immediately with the bringing of the firstborn, and after the blessing gives them to him[575].

And there are those who practice to give to the priest a silver bowl full of gold and silver coins, to show the nations the preciousness of their wealth, and the priest takes from it coins as the amount of the redemption[576].

The Order of Blessings and Giving

The blessings of the redemption[577], he blesses them with the giving of the money[578].

The father gives the money to the priest after the blessing[579] - and he needs to bless when the money is in his hand and extends it to the priest, before he transfers it from his hand to the hand of the priest[580] - so that the blessing precedes the action[581].

But it is not to do like those who have the custom to bless after they have placed the money before the priest[582].

And there are those who wrote that the redemption money is placed before the priest at the time of the blessing, and the son is with the priest, and after the blessing, the father takes the son from the hand of the priest and the priest takes the money[583].

And there are those who inclined to bless after giving the money, because while the priest has not taken the money, there is concern that he will refuse to accept them and it is impossible to bless[584].

The blessing of Shehecheyanu, there are those who wrote that it is recited with the blessing of the redemption[585], and there are those who wrote that it is recited after the priest has taken the money[586].

And there are those who wrote that initially the priest says the formula of the exchange and afterwards the father blesses “Shehecheyanu”[587].

The Saying of the Redemption

At the time of giving the money, the father says to the priest, "Here are these five selaim for the redemption of my son."[588].

And there are those who wrote that he says, “Here you have with this the equivalent of five silver shekels in the redemption of so-and-so my firstborn son which I have given you[589].”

And there are those who wrote that the priest says, I have received from you these five selaim for the redemption of your son and behold he is redeemed according to the law of Moses and Israel[590].

And there are those who wrote that the priest places the redemption money before him, and takes the son in his lap and says, this son is a firstborn, and the Holy One, blessed be He, wrote to redeem him, as it is said “And those that are to be redeemed from a month old you shall redeem”[591], when you were in your mother’s womb you were under the authority of your Father in heaven and under the authority of your father and mother, and now you are under my authority and your father and mother seek to redeem you because you are a sanctified firstborn, as it is written “And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, Sanctify to me all the firstborn, whatever opens the womb among the children of Israel, both of man and of beast, it is mine”[592], and behold these objects shall enter under you for your redemption and these objects shall be given as a gift to their owners, and if I have redeemed you properly, behold you are redeemed, and if not, behold you are redeemed according to the Torah and the law and as the most expert in Israel[593].

And there are those who wrote that the priest blesses the father and says to him, just as you merited to fulfill this commandment, so may you merit to fulfill all the commandments of the Torah[594].

Blessing on the Cup

After the redemption, the Geonim wrote that the priest takes a cup of wine and myrtle, and blesses “Creator of the fruit of the vine” and “Creator of fragrant trees,” and then blesses, "Blessed are You, Lord our God, King of the universe, who sanctified the embryo - and some say: formed the child[595] - in its mother’s womb, and at forty days divided its limbs two hundred and forty-eight, and then breathed into it a soul, as it is said, ‘And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul’[596], skin and flesh He clothed it, and with bones and sinews He

covered it, as it is said, ‘You have clothed me with skin and flesh, and have fenced me with bones and sinews’[597], and appointed for him - and some say: commanded for him[598], and some say: prepared for him[599], and some say: and fed him with the wonders of His miracles[600] - food and drink, honey and milk to delight him, and appointed His angels to guard him in his mother’s womb, as it is written, ‘Life and favor You have done with me, and Your visitation has preserved my spirit’[601], his father says this is my firstborn son - and some add here: and this is the beginning of my strength, and he is worthy to receive a double portion, as it is written in the Torah of Moses ‘to give him a double portion’[602] - his mother says this is my firstborn son through whom the Holy One, blessed be He, opened the doors of my womb, and we are obligated - and some read I am obligated[603] - five shekels to the priest to redeem him from him, for such is the commandment of the King of kings, the Holy One, blessed be He, as it is said, ‘But you shall surely redeem the firstborn of man’ etc.[604], and it is said, ‘And those that are to be redeemed from a month old you shall redeem, according to your estimation, for the money of five shekels, after the shekel of the sanctuary, which is twenty gerahs’[605], and it is said, ‘And you shall take five shekels apiece, by the head, after the shekel of the sanctuary you shall take, which is twenty gerahs the shekel’[606] - and some add here: just as this firstborn has merited redemption, so may he merit Torah, marriage canopy, and good deeds[607] - Blessed are You, Lord, who sanctifies the firstborn of Israel for their redemption[608].

And there are those who wrote in the wording of the conclusion, “Who sanctifies Israel with their firstborns and their redemption”[609]. And there are those who wrote that the recitation of the blessing “Who sanctified” precedes the act of redemption[610].

And the early ones wrote that another, who is not the priest, can bless the blessing “Who sanctified”, and when the priest does not know to bless, another blesses[611].

And what the sages saw to institute a blessing after the fulfillment of the commandment of the redemption of the firstborn - and likewise after the fulfillment of the commandment of circumcision[612] - unlike other commandments that do not have a blessing after them, the early authorities explained because the commandment of the redemption of the firstborn - and likewise circumcision - is performed once, and one does not return and become obligated in it forever, and it is not like other commandments that have no limit to their fulfillment[613].

And the early authorities wrote that it was not customary in France and Germany to recite the blessing “Who sanctified,” as we do not find any blessing mentioned that was not in the Mishnah or Tosefta or Gemara, because after the arrangement of the Talmud by Rav Ashi and Ravina no new blessing was innovated, and

furthermore, the priest does not perform any commandment but receives priestly gifts, so why should he bless, and they were puzzled by the wording at the beginning of the blessing which states “Who sanctified the fetus in its mother’s womb,” for if the intention is the sanctity of the firstborn, behold it is not from its mother’s womb but depends on the opening of the womb[614].

And so there are Geonim who wrote that this blessing has no basis and is nothing, and the Kohen has no permission to bless anything at the time of the redemption[615]. And later authorities wrote that this is the custom that they do not bless[616].

And there are those who have the custom to bless it[617]. And there are those who bless it without name and kingdom[618].

And there are those who wrote that one should not wonder about the priest blessing, because the commandment is fulfilled between both of them[619], and even though the priest does not perform a commandment[620], he nevertheless merits a son and gives him to the father in his redemption[621], and furthermore, this is not a blessing of the commandments*, but rather praise and thanks, and it is fitting for the priest to say it[622].

And what is said in the blessing “Who sanctified the fetus in its mother’s womb”, there are those who interpreted that the intention is not the sanctity of the firstborn, which depends on the opening of the womb, but rather the intention is the sanctity of every fetus, that when it is in its mother’s womb a candle is lit above its head and they teach it the entire Torah[623].

Those who bless the blessing “Who sanctified”, there are those who wrote that they should not say “his father says” etc., for even one who is a firstborn opening the womb and is not a firstborn from his father for inheritance is obligated in redemption[624], and even if this firstborn is also a firstborn for inheritance, since it is heard that the redemption of the son depends on this, it should not be said so[625].

And the early ones wrote that since there is no text of the blessing “Who sanctified” in the Talmud, we do not need to decide on it, and it does not prevent if one says this way or that[626].

And there are those who wrote a different version for the blessing: Who sanctified the fetus in its mother’s womb and formed it in forty days, and breathed into its nostrils the breath of life, clothed it with skin and flesh and with bones and sinews - covered it - life and kindness You have done with it and Your command has kept its spirit, and from the love of the Lord for it and keeping the oath which He swore to our forefathers, He brought us out with a strong hand from the hand of Pharaoh king of Egypt, and struck every firstborn in Egypt the first of strength

in the tents of Ham, and the firstborn of Israel He saved and sanctified them for His service, and commanded us to redeem them with five shekels, as it is said “And those that are to be redeemed from a month old you shall redeem according to your valuation, five shekels of silver according to the shekel of the sanctuary, which is twenty gerahs,” and commanded Israel to give their redemption to Aaron the priest and to his sons after him, as it is said “And you shall give the money to Aaron and to his sons the redemption of the excess among them”[627], blessed are You, Lord, who sanctifies the firstborn of Israel through their redemption[628].

Even those who did not practice the blessing “Who sanctified,” there are those who wrote that it is customary for the priest to bless over a cup of wine and drink[629], when there is wine in the city[630], to publicize the matter[631], and to honor the priest[632], and that cup of wine there are those who practiced that it should be prepared before the redemption to bless over it[633], and there are those whose words suggest that it is poured after the redemption[634], and when there is no wine, he blesses over beer, and since they do not bless over beer during the meal, according to those who hold this view[635], whenever there is no wine, they perform the redemption before the start of the meal so that he can bless over the beer[636], and there are those who wrote that the priest gives from the wine also to the father of the son[637], but over myrtle they did not practice to bless[638].

On the blessing of the cup in the redemption of the firstborn on the Ninth of Av or other fasts, see also Ta’anit and see Ninth of Av[639].

The Text of Exchange and the Blessing of the Priest

After the blessing, the priest takes the money in his hand and places it over the head of the son and says, this money is in exchange for this, this is in place of this, this is redeemed - and some say: redeemed[640] - for this, this money goes to the priest, the son shall enter into life, into Torah, into the wedding canopy, and into the fear of Heaven[641].

And there are those who wrote that he says, and the father enters into life, and the son into Torah and wedding canopy and good deeds[642]. And there are those who do not have the custom to say the text of the exchanges[643].

And the priest blesses the father of the son and says, May it be the will from before the God of the heavens that just as you have brought him to redemption, so may you bring him to Torah, to the wedding canopy, and to good deeds[644].

And if the son is grown, the priest blesses the father as he sees fit[645].

And he places his hand on the head of the son and says, “The Lord bless you and keep you”[646], “For length of days and years of life and peace they will add to you”[647], “He will not allow your foot to falter; your guardian will not slumber”[648], “By day the sun will not smite you, nor the moon by night. The Lord will guard you from all evil; He will guard your soul. The Lord will guard your going out and your coming in from now and forevermore”[649], and whoever extends the blessing, behold, this is praiseworthy[650].

And also a firstborn who redeems himself, the priest blesses him in this order[651].

And there are those who wrote that before this blessing the priest needs to straighten his hands and lean on the head of the firstborn, and says three times, “Here is Elisha son of Shaphat who poured water on the hands of Elijah”[652], and it is good to be saved from all evil[653].

If the rabbi is there, there are those who have written that he too blesses the firstborn[654].

In the redemption of a firstborn who has died, the priest takes the money and says, “This money is for the redemption of your firstborn son who is in the grave,” and blesses the father and says that the name will bless him, and fulfill in him these verses, “The Lord will command the blessing upon you in your storehouses” etc.[655], “And I will make you fruitful and multiply you, and establish My covenant with you” etc.[656], “And God Almighty will bless you and make you fruitful and multiply you etc. and give you the blessing of Abraham” etc. [657], and he extends them according to his strength and tongue[658].

That the joy is in His dwelling

In the Grace After Meals of the Redemption of the Firstborn Son meal - when there is a quorum[659] - there are those who wrote that they say “that the joy is in His abode”[660].

And there are those who wrote that it is not customary to say “that the joy is in His dwelling,” and they gave a reason, for behold, they redeem also a firstborn who died[661], and it is not appropriate to say at his redemption “that the joy is in His dwelling,” and therefore, because of not differentiating*, it is not said at any redemption[662].

And the later authorities wrote that such is the custom[663].

Footnotes

1. ↑ See Beraita Kiddushin 29b and Tosefta there, Chapter 1; Rambam Bikkurim Chapter 11, Halacha 1 and Sefer HaMitzvot Positive Commandment 80; see Sefer Mitzvot Gadol Positive Commandment 144; Sefer HaChinuch Commandment 312; Tur and Shulchan Aruch Yoreh De'ah 305:1. And see Rambam Bechorot Chapter 1, Halacha 1 and Sefer HaMitzvot Positive Commandment 79 and Sefer HaChinuch Commandment 18 (and Sefer Mitzvot Gadol Positive Commandment 210), who counted besides this a positive commandment to separate and sanctify the firstborns and to distinguish them for what is appropriate to be done with them, including the firstborn of a human, and the meaning of the commandment needs clarification.
2. ↑ Exodus 13:13. Jerusalem Talmud Kiddushin Chapter 1, Halacha 7.
3. ↑ Exodus 22:28. Sefer HaMitzvot there. And see Midrash Rabba Shemot there: "The firstborn of your sons you shall give to Me," one might think to give them to Him literally, therefore it says (Numbers 3:51) "and Moses gave the redemption money to Aaron and his sons," I only know about that time, how do I know for generations, therefore it says (there) "by the word of the Lord, as the Lord commanded Moses." And see Sefer HaMitzvot there, that through redemption the giving to the priest is fulfilled, as if the priest acquired the firstborn and redeemed it from him.
4. ↑ Exodus 34:19-20. Gemara Kiddushin there; Rambam Bikkurim there.
5. ↑ Numbers 18:15. Rambam Bikkurim there and Sefer HaMitzvot there; Sefer HaChinuch there.
6. ↑ Bahag Introduction Positive Commandment 6; Sefer HaMitzvot there; Sefer Mitzvot Gadol there; Sefer HaChinuch there; Yereim Section 140. And see R. Isaac Perla Positive Commandments 14-15, who discusses the opinion of R. Isaac of Gaeta, whether the commandment for a person to redeem himself and the commandment for the father to redeem him are two separate commandments.
7. ↑ And see R. Yom Tov Algazi Chapter 8, Section 65, Note 5, regarding a firstborn mamzer if he is obligated in redemption.
8. ↑ See Mishnah Kiddushin 29a and Gemara there.
9. ↑ Kiddushin there; Rambam Bikkurim Chapter 11, Halacha 2; Tur and Shulchan Aruch Yoreh De'ah 305:2.
10. ↑ Numbers 18:15.
11. ↑ Maharsha Kiddushin there.
12. ↑ Maharsha there.
13. ↑ See Note 12 and onwards. See Rashi Kiddushin there s.v. "to redeem."
14. ↑ See also Firstborn of a Human Note 7.

15. ↑ Kiddushin there; Rambam there. And see the commentary of R. Hananel ben Samuel Kiddushin there, who reads before “you shall redeem” with a kamatz and afterwards “you shall redeem” with a sheva, and the meaning of the derasha is the same. And see Note 19 and onwards.
16. ↑ Minchat Chinuch Commandment 312, and see Rambam and Shulchan Aruch below and Sefer HaChinuch there.
17. ↑ Kiddushin 29a; Rambam Bikkurim Chapter 11, Halacha 2; Tur and Shulchan Aruch Yoreh De’ah 305:15.
18. ↑ Tosafot Bechorot 49b s.v. “and his”; Rambam there. And see Derashot HaRan Bechorot Chapter 8, Note 17 and Responsa Chatam Sofer Yoreh De’ah Part 2, Section 295, and see Shach Yoreh De’ah Section 305, Subsection 11. And see Note 47.
19. ↑ Tosafot there.
20. ↑ Numbers 18:15. Kiddushin there. And see Maharshal there that according to the version of the Gemara before us, it should be explained that they expounded the double language. And see Torat HaYad there, according to his version, they expounded from the verse there 16: “and his redemption from a month old you shall redeem,” which is extra, after it already said “you shall surely redeem,” and see R. Jonah of Lunel who pointed to Exodus 34:20: “all the firstborn of your sons you shall redeem.”
21. ↑ Maharsha Kiddushin there.
22. ↑ Maharsha there.
23. ↑ Kiddushin there, according to the version and explanation of Rashi there s.v. “you shall be redeemed” and Perush HaRif and R. Hananel ben Samuel there. And see Torat HaYad there, that according to the scripture with a sheva it should have been written “you shall be redeemed,” and the tradition “you shall redeem” means with a kamatz.
24. ↑ See also “There is if to the tradition”; “There is if to the scripture” Note 98.
25. ↑ Ran Kiddushin there (12a); Nimukei Yosef there. And see R. Jonah of Lunel there. And see R. Joseph Yavetz Yoreh De’ah Section 305, Subsection 24.
26. ↑ Exodus 13:13.
27. ↑ Jerusalem Talmud Kiddushin 1:7. And see Midrash HaZohar (Epstein) Exodus 13: “And every firstborn of man among your sons you shall redeem,” teaching that the son is obligated to redeem himself, and similarly in the verse there, however, it seems they derived it from the redundancy of the text, not from the word “man,” and see Shach there who derived from this text as in note 18.
28. ↑ Keter Aram Tzova there; see Pnei Moshe there.
29. ↑ Exodus 13:15.
30. ↑ Mekhilta and Yalkut Shimoni below. And see Ziv Rimon there that “I will redeem” implies that I will redeem myself.
31. ↑ See also Circumcision and see Torah Study.
32. ↑ See the aforementioned entries and see Avot 1: Obligations of the Father.

33. ↑ Mekhilta of Rabbi Ishmael, Tractate of Passover 18; Yalkut Shimoni Exodus 235. And see Midrash HaZohar (Hoffman) Exodus 34: “Every firstborn of your sons you shall redeem” (Exodus 34:20) that if the father did not redeem him, when he grows up he is obligated to redeem himself.
34. ↑ See Maharil below.
35. ↑ Maharil Laws of Redemption of the Firstborn letter 5 in the name of Rabbi Nathan; Rema in Shulchan Aruch there. And see Maharil there that they write “son of a Kohen,” so he knows he is called “son of a Kohen” until he is redeemed.
36. ↑ See also Circumcision.
37. ↑ Shita Le’Nefesh to Kiddushin 29a; see Darkei Moshe Yoreh De’ah 305 subparagraph 9 in the opinion of Rivash, Siman 131, and Rema in Shulchan Aruch there, subparagraph 10, and see below; Tzida LaDerech Exodus 13:13 in the opinion of Rivash there (even though he holds that they can redeem him, see below).
38. ↑ Shita Le’Nefesh to there.
39. ↑ Atzmot Yosef Kiddushin there. And similarly in Tzida LaDerech there.
40. ↑ Sefer HaNiyar Siman 39. And there it concludes: Alternatively, because he is an adult, he redeems himself, and perhaps his intention is that it is not an absolute obligation on the court, and see notes 227, 240.
41. ↑ Responsa Chatam Sofer Yoreh De’ah Part 2 Siman 297 (and see there Siman 295 where he wrote that there is no commandment for the court, and it needs clarification).
42. ↑ See note 15.
43. ↑ Responsa Rashba Part 2 Siman 321; Sefer HaChinuch Commandment 392: apparently; see Meiri Pesachim 121b. And see Responsa Rashba there his proof, for the lien on the father’s property has not been removed, see below.
44. ↑ Rashba there.
45. ↑ Exodus 13:13.
46. ↑ Sefer HaChinuch there.
47. ↑ Minchat Chinuch there.
48. ↑ Rashba there.
49. ↑ Rashba there: It seems. And see Minchat Chinuch there, that if the son preceded and redeemed, he is obligated to his father ten gold coins, as the law of one who snatches a commandment from his fellow in Choshen Mishpat Siman 382.
50. ↑ See Rivash Siman 131 and Kenesset HaGedolah Yoreh De’ah Siman 305 Hagahot Beit Yosef letter 19 in his opinion; see HaParnas Siman 293.
51. ↑ The questioner (Maharshal the last owner of Kohenet Olam) in Shut Chatam Sofer YD Part 2 Siman 293.
52. ↑ See above.
53. ↑ See Chatam Sofer there.
54. ↑ See below. See Rashi Bechorot 49a s.v. “Yachzir.”

55. ↑ Mishnah Bechorot there; Rambam Bikkurim Chapter 11 Halacha 17; Tur YD 305; Rema in Shulchan Aruch there Siman 12. And see RH to Sifrei Korach 118, which implies from his words that there is no redemption for a firstborn who died, and see SDR there who questions him. And see Shut Radbaz manuscript Siman 187, that they redeem initially before burial.
56. ↑ Tohorat HaKodesh in Shmak Bechorot 12b.
57. ↑ Exodus 13:15.
58. ↑ Midrash Rabba Exodus 13.
59. ↑ Bechorot 51b.
60. ↑ Numbers 18:15.
61. ↑ See Leviticus 27:2, and more. See Ragmah and Rashi Bechorot there.
62. ↑ See Mishnah Arachin 20a and see also Arachin.
63. ↑ Rashi Bechorot there s.v. “Erech.” And see Tosafot R. Akiva Eiger Bechorot Chapter 8 Mishnah 6, who explains that they learned the obligation of valuations after the one being valued died, and it needs clarification, and see Berachot Shalom below.
64. ↑ Exodus 34:20.
65. ↑ Bechorot there.
66. ↑ Exodus 23:15.
67. ↑ See Rashi Bechorot there s.v. “Mah,” and see also Olot Re’iyah.
68. ↑ See Rashi there.
69. ↑ See Bechorot there and Rashi there s.v. “Af.”
70. ↑ See Rashi there; Shut Radbaz manuscript Siman 187. And see below about a firstborn who died in his youth.
71. ↑ Orchot Chaim below s.v.
72. ↑ Orchot Chaim laws of redemption of firstborns in the name of some sages.
73. ↑ Orchot Chaim there, and see above.
74. ↑ See above.
75. ↑ See Shaarei Yosher Chapter 25 letter 664, and see the notes of Rabbi Y.S. Bechorot 49a. And see Meiri Pesachim 121b: the father is obligated to redeem him in the grave. And see Radbaz mentioned in note 54.
76. ↑ Berakhot Kiddushin Siman 18; see Tzafnat Paneach Metia Perek 8 Halacha 3, and there Halacha 2; see Shaarei Yosher there Ot 663. And see below the matters regarding this.
77. ↑ See also Cheresh Shoteh and Katan.
78. ↑ Berakhot there. And what is written that only according to his words he is exempt, needs clarification, for seemingly according to all opinions it is impossible to obligate the father when he became sane because of a son he had when he was insane. And see there that he wrote another practical difference, that according to his words, properties acquired by the father after the son’s death are not obligated for redemption, and are not like properties acquired while the son was alive which are obligated according to those who hold so, see above, and this too needs clarification, for seemingly according to all opinions it is so.
79. ↑ Rivash Siman 131.

80. ↑ Berakhot Kiddushin Siman 18.
81. ↑ See Gra Yoreh De’ah 305 Se’if Katan 15 and Berakhot there in his opinion, and see the words of the questioner in the aforementioned Rivash.
82. ↑ Tzafnat Paneach Arachin Perek 3 Halacha 13.
83. ↑ Tzafnat Paneach Metia Perek 1 Halacha 1 Dibur HaMatchil “And see in the words”. And see Tzafnat Paneach Yesodei HaTorah Perek 6 Halacha 3, that the father’s redemption is a continuous redemption and his own redemption is a completed matter.
84. ↑ See also Pe’utot and see Katan.
85. ↑ See Shut Zikaron Yosef Yoreh De’ah end of Siman 26, in the words of the Rambam cited in note 16.
86. ↑ Zikaron Yosef there.
87. ↑ See note 254.
88. ↑ Shut Chikrei Halacha Ma’arechet 2 Ot 2. And see the aforementioned note, that it is stated that all this is when the son died before he was obligated in the redemption of his son.
89. ↑ Shut Yehuda Ya’aleh Yoreh De’ah Siman 266.
90. ↑ Shut Chatam Sofer Yoreh De’ah Part 2 Siman 292. And see also Matnot Kehuna. And see Malbushei Yom Tov Siman 559 Se’if Katan 3, brought in Eliyah Rabbah and Mishnah Berurah there, that in the redemption of the son on Tisha B’Av postponed, the father and the Kohen do not complete the fast.
91. ↑ See Rosh Bekhorot Hilchot Pidyon Bekhor Siman 1, who postponed because of this the blessing of the Kohen, see note 346, and see Rivash Siman 131 who proved this from Pesachim 121b. And see Shut Torat Chaim (Zonnenfeld) Siman 28.
92. ↑ See also Aninut note 38.
93. ↑ Shut Yehuda Ya’aleh Part 1 Yoreh De’ah Siman 355.
94. ↑ Pesachim 87 and Shacharit Shemot 13; Rambam Bikkurim Perek 1 Halacha 7 and Perek 11 Halacha 6; Ramban Bekhorot Perek 5; Sefer HaChinuch Mitzvah 392; Meiri Pesachim 121b; Rosh Bekhorot Perek 5 Siman 13; Tur Yoreh De’ah 305.
95. ↑ Pesachim 87 and Shacharit there; see Ramban there; see Rosh there; Beit Yosef there; Bach there. And see Aruch HaShulchan Yoreh De’ah there Se’if 15.
96. ↑ See also Chutz La’aretz note 16. Kiryat Sefer Bikkurim there; Bach there.
97. ↑ Rambam Bikkurim Perek 11 Halacha 6; Sefer HaChinuch Mitzvah 392; Meiri Pesachim 121b; Tur Yoreh De’ah 305.
98. ↑ HaEshkol (Albeck) Hilchot Pidyon HaBen (102b); see Ramban Bekhorot Perek 5; see Rosh Bekhorot Perek 5 Siman 13; Beit Yosef there; Bach there. And see Aruch HaShulchan Yoreh De’ah there Se’if 15.
99. ↑ Bekhorot 9b, and see there 12b; Rosh Bekhorot Perek 1 Siman 11.
100. ↑ Ragmah there; Rashi there Dibur HaMatchil “Bekhor”.
101. ↑ Deuteronomy 15:19.
102. ↑ See Bekhorot there. And see Rashi there who wrote the reason for the permission because we did not find it forbidden, and see Maharsha there.

103. ↑ Ragmah there.
104. ↑ See Tosafot Bekhorot 49b s.v. “V’didei” (and Tosefot HaRosh in Shitah Mekubetzet there) and Ketzot HaChoshen Siman 66 Se’if Katan 20 and Netivot HaMishpat there Se’if Katan 23 in their opinion.
105. ↑ Netivot HaMishpat there.
106. ↑ See Mishnah Bekhorot 49a; see Baraitot Bekhorot 12b; Sifrei Zuta Numbers 18:17; Rambam Bikkurim Chapter 11 Halacha 17; Tur Shulchan Aruch Yoreh De’ah 305:11.
107. ↑ See Ragmah Bekhorot 12b; see Rashi Bava Kamma 11b s.v. “Ein” and Menachot 37a s.v. “Shomea” and Bekhorot 49a s.v. “Yachzir”; Sefer HaChinuch there. And see Shabbat 135b, and see Mechaber attributed to Ran there, that because of those who are doubtful stillborns, the scripture equated its measures to estimate for all of them thirty days, and see Ritva there who wrote similarly but it implies from his words that according to Rabbi Shimon ben Gamliel in Shabbat there, anyone known not to be a stillborn indeed redeems him earlier, and see Shitah Mekubetzet Bava Kamma there in the name of Rid, that the reason of the scripture is due to the doubt of stillborn, and see further.
108. ↑ Numbers 18:16. Sifrei Zuta there; Rashi Bava Kamma there and Menachot there and Bekhorot 12b s.v. “Achar”; Tosafot Bava Kamma 11b s.v. “Bekhor”; Rambam there; Sefer HaChinuch there.
109. ↑ See Rashi Bava Kamma there and Menachot there and Bekhorot 49a there, and Tosafot Bava Kamma there s.v. “Bekhor” as it somewhat implies in Rashi’s words. And see citation 107.
110. ↑ Tosafot Bava Kamma there; Tosafot Menachot there s.v. “Shomea”; Tosafot Bekhorot 49a s.v. “Met”; Rashba Bava Kamma there; Meiri Bava Kamma there and Shabbat 135b; Mechaber attributed to Ran Shabbat there; Shitah Mekubetzet Bava Kamma there.
111. ↑ Mishnah Bekhorot 49a.
112. ↑ Numbers 3:40.
113. ↑ Rashi Bekhorot there s.v. “U’ma’aleh”.
114. ↑ Numbers 18:16.
115. ↑ Gemara Bekhorot there and Rashi there s.v. “MiMidbar”. And see Peirush HaMishnayot of Rambam Bekhorot Chapter 8 Mishnah 6, where the sages learned the redemption of the firstborn from Erechin, see further.
116. ↑ See Erechin 18a and Rashi Bekhorot there s.v. “Misafeka”.
117. ↑ See also “Two verses that come as one”.
118. ↑ Yir’eh Shamayim Siman 140; Ra’avad Bekhorot Chapter 8 Mishnah 6.
119. ↑ Mishnah and Gemara there and Rashi there s.v. “Aval”. On the reason that the priest’s seizure is effective, see Tosafot Bekhorot 48b s.v. “Ve’im”, and see also “Seizure”.
120. ↑ Rambam Bikkurim Chapter 11 Halacha 17; Tur Shulchan Aruch Yoreh De’ah 305:12.
121. ↑ See also “Month: Month of the Moon”.
122. ↑ Citation 92 and onwards. And see Derech Emunah Bikkurim Chapter 11 Se’if Katan 107 and there in Sha’ar HaTziyun Se’if Katan 242.

123. ↑ See the book of responsa below.
124. ↑ See citation 107.
125. ↑ Responsa Teshuvot VeHanhagot Volume 3 Siman 130 in the name of Rabbi Shlomo Zalman Auerbach; see Responsa Shevet HaLevi Volume 9 Siman 228; see Responsa Yabia Omer Volume 9 Yoreh De'ah Siman 37.
126. ↑ See Responsa Chalik"i YD Siman 178; see Responsa Tzitz Eliezer Vol. 9 Siman 28 Ot 8, and there in the name of Responsa Da'at Sofer; see Torat HaYoledet (p. 390) in the name of Rabbi Yosef Shalom Elyashiv.
127. ↑ Sefer HaChinuch Mitzvah 292.
128. ↑ Yere'im Siman 140. And see citation 133.
129. ↑ See Tosafot Bava Batra 5b s.v. "Ki"; see Sefer HaChinuch there; Rosh Hilchot Pidyon Bechor Siman 1; Tur Shulchan Aruch YD 305:11.
130. ↑ Hilchot Ketzuvot Hilchot Bechorot.
131. ↑ Sefer HaChinuch there. And from there, even if the son redeems himself, the father has nullified his commandment.
132. ↑ See Tosafot Moed Katan 8b s.v. "Mipnei" and Magen Avraham Siman 568 Sif Katan 10 in their opinion; see Rishonim and Poskim below; see Rashash Menachot 66a. And see Avnei Nezer YD Siman 395, that there is no prohibition in postponement.
133. ↑ See Tosafot Moed Katan 8b s.v. "Mipnei Torach", and Magen Avraham Siman 568 Sif Katan 10 in their opinion.
134. ↑ Responsa Yehuda Ya'aleh YD Siman 267 in the matter of Tania below.
135. ↑ Sefer Tania Siman 98; Levush Orach Chaim Siman 551:17. And see Bach YD 305, from the words of Rav Sheshet Bechorot 13a, that from the thirtieth day and onward "he transgresses upon it".
136. ↑ See above.
137. ↑ See Bach YD 305.
138. ↑ Meiri Pesachim 121b.
139. ↑ Meiri there, therefore it is customary to always add a fifth.
140. ↑ See below.
141. ↑ See Meiri there that special piyutim were instituted for the redemption done on the wedding day.
142. ↑ And see Turei Even Rosh Hashanah 4a and Responsa Yehuda Ya'aleh YD Siman 262.
143. ↑ Mordechai, brought in Mahari"l Hilchot Pidyon HaBen; Terumat HaDeshen Part 1 Siman 269 and Part 2 Siman 233; Mahari of Bruna Siman 121 in the name of Mahari of Ropruk; Shulchan Aruch YD 305:11.
144. ↑ See Rivash Siman 156 and Terumat HaDeshen below, and see Responsa Mahari Weil Siman 189 for additional reasons not to redeem on Shabbat, and see also Shvut.
145. ↑ See below.
146. ↑ See Terumat HaDeshen below.
147. ↑ See below.
148. ↑ See below.
149. ↑ See above.
150. ↑ Terumat HaDeshen there.

151. ↑ Mahari Bruna there in the name of Yesh Omrim, and in the note there that this is the opinion of Maharin.
152. ↑ Yesh Shlomoh Kiddushin Chapter 1 Siman 54, and see there for the reason. And see there that the Mordechai brought by Mahari"l in citation 118 is from the gloss, and should not be regarded.
153. ↑ Mahari Bruna there in the name of Rabbi Yitzchak of Vienna and all the sages of Austria.
154. ↑ Mahari Bruna there in the name of Rabbi Shimon of Neustadt and Rabbi Meishterl.
155. ↑ See also Chodesh Tzion 93.
156. ↑ Shach Yoreh De’ah Siman 305 Subsection 19.
157. ↑ See citation 444.
158. ↑ See citation 176.
159. ↑ See also Ta’anit.
160. ↑ Bach below.
161. ↑ Responsa Bach Siman 122.
162. ↑ Shach Yoreh De’ah Siman 305 Subsection 12. See there for his proof.
163. ↑ Shach there; Responsa Givat Olam Yoreh De’ah General 6 Siman 10, that there are places that practice thus, and see below. And see Yehuda Ya’aleh in citation 173 in the words of the Gra.
164. ↑ Migdal Oz below; see Chokhmat Adam General 150 Siman 8.
165. ↑ See Exodus 14:15.
166. ↑ See Exodus 12:29.
167. ↑ Migdal Oz to Ya’avetz Berachot Hori Pleg 3 Letter 5.
168. ↑ Givat Olam there, that this is the custom of Egypt, and he agreed with the custom.
169. ↑ See Givat Olam there in the name of a rabbi whose strength is great; Responsa Yehuda Ya’aleh Yoreh De’ah Siman 262.
170. ↑ See citation 443.
171. ↑ Migdal Oz to Ya’avetz there.
172. ↑ Shach there.
173. ↑ See also Chodesh Tzion 38 and onwards.
174. ↑ See also Chodesh Tzion 96.
175. ↑ Noda Biyhuda Yoreh De’ah Siman 187, and the gloss of Rabbi Akiva Eiger Yoreh De’ah 305 Siman 11 in his name. And see Derech Emunah in citation 122, that some have the custom because of this to redeem after midday, because in the summer when the nights are short, it is possible that even in the morning of the thirty-first day, 29 days, 12 hours, and 793 parts from the time of birth have not yet passed.
176. ↑ Novi"t there and in Dagam"r Siman 568, and Ra’ak"a there. And see there that it is stated that only when the fast is the next day, they wrote to do it at night.
177. ↑ See Tziyon 142 and onwards.
178. ↑ Yehuda Ya’aleh there; Kitzur Shulchan Aruch Siman 164 Se’if 3. And see Yehuda Ya’aleh there, that nevertheless, since it is a preferred mitzvah to redeem during the day, according to his opinion, see Tziyon 163, there is no

cancellation of the mitzvah if postponed to the day to fulfill the preferred mitzvah.

179. ↑ See Shu"t Bach Siman 122; see Magen Avraham Siman 568 Se'if Katan 10; Yehuda Ya'aleh there in the words of the Gra Yoreh De'ah Siman 305 Se'if Katan 20; Shu"t Maharshal Part 2 Siman 43.
180. ↑ See Shu"t Gur Aryeh Yehuda Yoreh De'ah Siman 116; Chayei Adam there. And see Gur Aryeh Yehuda there for the reason of the custom, because one should not make the Pidyon HaBen meal on Motza'ei Shabbat lest one slaughter on Shabbat.
181. ↑ Magen Avraham there. And see below when to redeem when the time of redemption is on a fast day.
182. ↑ Novi"t there; Chayei Adam there.
183. ↑ See Tziyon 459.
184. ↑ See also Chodesh Tziyon 93.
185. ↑ Shach Yoreh De'ah Siman 305 Se'if Katan 12. And see Tziyon 170 and onwards.
186. ↑ Shu"t Gur Aryeh Yehuda Yoreh De'ah Siman 116, and see there for additional reasons not to perform the redemption on Tisha B'Av, and see Shu"t Elef Lecha Shlomo Orach Chaim Siman 349.
187. ↑ See also Chodesh Tziyon 98.
188. ↑ See Yam Shel Shlomo Kiddushin Chapter 1 Siman 54; see Magen Avraham Siman 568 Se'if Katan 10, and Siman 339 Se'if Katan 8.
189. ↑ See Elef Lecha Shlomo there.
190. ↑ Glosses of Chatam Sofer Orach Chaim Siman 568, brought in Mishnah Berurah there Se'if Katan 20; Aruch HaShulchan Yoreh De'ah Siman 305 Se'if 45.
191. ↑ Sha'ar HaTziyun there Se'if Katan 24. And see also Chodesh Tziyon 96.
192. ↑ Kitzur Shulchan Aruch Siman 164 Se'if 3.
193. ↑ See Shu"t Bach Siman 122. And see Tziyon 161.
194. ↑ See also Milah.
195. ↑ Yosef Ometz Order and Customs of Pidyon HaBen; Tzitz Eliezer Siman 128 (from the author's son); Shivath Tziyon Siman 54; Chaim Sha'al Part 1 Siman 31; Yehuda Ya'aleh Yoreh De'ah Siman 267. And see Chaim Sha'al there, that even though the obligation of circumcision preceded and has not yet been fulfilled, one should not postpone the redemption when it can be fulfilled, and furthermore, the obligation of redemption truly preceded, because since circumcision cannot be performed due to coercion, its obligation has not yet taken effect.
196. ↑ See Yosef Ometz there; see Chaim Sha'al there, and see there that he added, that since the mitzvah is incumbent upon the father, what difference does it make if the son has not been sanctified with circumcision, the father is still obligated to redeem him. And see Yosef Ometz there who added that if the child dies before circumcision, it turns out that the father has nullified a positive commandment he was obligated in and has no compensation, and see Tziyon 55, and it requires further study.
197. ↑ See Yehoshua 5:5 and Yevamot 72a.

198. ↑ See above. Tzitz Eliezer there and Chaim Sha’al there.
199. ↑ Yosef Ometz there, as the sages of his city, may they rest in peace, agreed, and at the time of redemption, all the sages of Ashkenaz were there, and he was uncertain if they were of the same opinion.
200. ↑ See Ran"ch and Yad Eliyahu below, and see also Chaviva Mitzvah B’Sha’atah: regarding precedence.
201. ↑ Responsa Ranach, Siman 79, brought in Shach Yoreh De’ah 305, subparagraph 12, and see Tzemach Tzedek there in his opinion, and see Responsa Chatam Sofer Yoreh De’ah Part 2, Siman 300, that it is an adornment for the mitzvah of redemption to be with a circumcised person and not with an uncircumcised one, and see there another reason to prioritize the circumcision. And see Responsa Yehuda Ya’aleh Yoreh De’ah Siman 267, that if the time for redemption arrives at night, one must redeem immediately and not wait until after the circumcision during the day.
202. ↑ See above.
203. ↑ Chaim Sha’al there.
204. ↑ Responsa Yad Eliyahu (of Lublin) Siman 54. And see Migdal Oz of Yaavetz Berachot Hori Siman 3, letter 16.
205. ↑ Tziyon 106 and onwards.
206. ↑ Rashi Bechorot 49a, s.v. Dekul Alma.
207. ↑ Tur below.
208. ↑ Bechorot there (and in Ramban and the glosses of Bach that they are the words of Rabba, and in Or Zarua and Rosh and Shitah Mekubetzet there: Rava); Rambam Bikkurim Chapter 11, Halacha 18; Tur Shulchan Aruch Yoreh De’ah 305:13.
209. ↑ Rashi there; Taz Yoreh De’ah 305, subparagraph 12. And see Ritva Algazi Chapter 8, Siman 74, letter 1, and the notes of Rabbi Yitzchak Shmelkes Bechorot there, on the reason that the money is a gift and not a deposit.
210. ↑ See Ritva Algazi there, according to Rav Bava Metzia 15b, and see there what he wrote in explanation of Rashi’s words.
211. ↑ Rashi there.
212. ↑ Bechorot there (and according to the above version, they are the words of Rabba or Rava); see Rambam and Tur Shulchan Aruch there.
213. ↑ Rashi there.
214. ↑ Rashi there, s.v. Nitaklu.
215. ↑ Bechorot there.
216. ↑ See Kiddushin 59a, and also see Kiddushin. Gemara there (and according to the above version, Rabba or Rava) in explanation of Rav’s opinion.
217. ↑ Bechorot there.
218. ↑ Gemara there (and according to the above version, Rabba or Rava) in explanation of Shmuel’s opinion.
219. ↑ See above.
220. ↑ See Terumat HaDeshen Siman 269.
221. ↑ See also Halacha Tziyon 810. See Ramban and Rosh below.

222. ↑ Rambam there; Ramban Hilchot Bechorot Chapter 8 (61b); Sefer Mitzvot Katan Siman 245; Rosh Bechorot Chapter 8, Siman 5; Tur Yoreh De’ah 305, and see Beit Yosef and in the commentary there, and see Taz there, subparagraph 14.
223. ↑ Bechorot there, and so it is before us.
224. ↑ Tosafot Bava Kama 70a, s.v. Amataltalin; Yereim Siman 140; Sefer Mitzvot Gadol Positive Commandment 144; Or Zarua Part 1, Siman 521; see Rokeach Siman 360. And see Bahag Siman 73 and Ramban and Rosh there in the name of Halachot Pesukot, and see Ramban and Rosh there what they deliberated in his opinion. And see Terumat HaDeshen Siman 269 and Darkei Chaim and Yom Tov to Rosh there.
225. ↑ Shulchan Aruch there, Siman 13.
226. ↑ See Taz H"D Part 2 Siman 234; Rema there.
227. ↑ Taz Y"D there S"K 15.
228. ↑ See above.
229. ↑ Taz H"D Part 2 there; Rema there.
230. ↑ See Maharshal below and Taz there S"K 15.
231. ↑ Responsa Maharshal Siman 7 in the opinion of several Rishonim.
232. ↑ Taz there S"K 14 in the opinion of Taz H"D Part 2 Siman 234.
233. ↑ Taz there S"K 15.
234. ↑ Yesh Sh Kiddushin Perek 1 Siman 54.
235. ↑ Da’at Kedoshim Siman 305 S"K 11.
236. ↑ Yesh Sh Kiddushin Perek 1 Siman 54.
237. ↑ Taz Siman 269; Responsa Bach Siman 125; Novee"t below.
238. ↑ Taz and Novee"t there.
239. ↑ See Tziyon 215.
240. ↑ Taz there.
241. ↑ See Tziyon 107.
242. ↑ Novee"t Y"D Siman 187.
243. ↑ Tosefta Bekhorot Perek 6.
244. ↑ See Beraita Bekhorot 12b and Rashi there D"H and add in its explanation. And see Tziyon 181.
245. ↑ Mishnah Bekhorot 49b; Tosefta Bekhorot Perek 6.
246. ↑ Mishnah Bekhorot 49b; Tosefta Bekhorot Perek 6.
247. ↑ See also Hekdesh. B"H"G below.
248. ↑ B"H"G Siman 73.
249. ↑ HaEshkol (Ratzba) Hilchot Pidyon HaBen Siman 42, and HaEshkol (Albeck) Hilchot Pidyon HaBen 102a.
250. ↑ Ramban Hilchot Bekhorot Perek 8 (63a).
251. ↑ Teshuvot HaGeonim Harakavi Siman 73 and Ramban there from the response of Rav Hai Gaon, and see there that the additional sixth required in the redemption of the firstborn is due to currency changes.
252. ↑ Teshuvot HaGeonim Sha’arei Teshuvah Siman 47 and Orach Chaim Hilchot Pidyon Bechorot Siman 1, and there it is stated that this is what our sages of blessed memory said.
253. ↑ Responsa Maharik Siman 133.

254. ↑ Responsa Chatam Sofer, brought in Ot Brit (Kunitz) Siman Katan 9.
255. ↑ Menachot 37a; Ramban Hilchot Bechorot Chapter 8 (6b); Tur Yoreh De’ah 305. And see Migdal Oz to Yaavetz Berachot Horei Peleg 1 Ot 30, who wondered about the Rambam and Shulchan Aruch who omitted it, and it cannot be said that they thought it was not a reality, for it is brought in the Talmud that it was an actual event and it is something that happened even in our times.
256. ↑ Tashbetz Part 2 Siman 235; Responsa Radbaz Siman 496; Rema in Shulchan Aruch Yoreh De’ah 305:10; Derech Chaim Hilchot Pidyon Bechor Ot 3; R' Yitzchak Algazi Bechorot Chapter 8 Ot 67 Siman Katan 3.
257. ↑ See also Eved Kena’ani and see Po’el.
258. ↑ Tashbetz there. And see Radbaz there, that if there was a relevant giving, it would suffice.
259. ↑ Sifrei Zuta Bamidbar 18.
260. ↑ Mishnah Bechorot 51a; Tosefta Bechorot Chapter 6.
261. ↑ Mekhilta; Sifrei Korach 118.
262. ↑ Mishnah Bechorot 51a; Tosefta Bechorot Chapter 6.
263. ↑ Mishnah Bechorot 51a; Tosefta Bechorot Chapter 6.
264. ↑ Mishnah Bechorot 51a. Ketubot 102b.
265. ↑ Bnei Yaakov 104; Sha’arei Meir Shabbat Chapter 23 Halacha 14; Responsa Kol Eliyahu Part 1 Yoreh De’ah Siman 25. B’R’Y.
266. ↑ Maharil.
267. ↑ See also Acharayut.
268. ↑ See Nekudat HaKesef Yoreh De’ah Siman 305 Siman Katan 1; Chatam Sofer.
269. ↑ Responsa Chemdat Shlomo Yoreh De’ah Siman 31 Ot 20: It seems certain.
270. ↑ HaEshkol (Ratzba) Hilchot Pidyon HaBen Siman 42.
271. ↑ Likutei HaPardes to Rashi on the matter of Pidyon HaBen.
272. ↑ Hilchot Ketzuvot Hilchot Bechorot.
273. ↑ Maharil Hilchot Pidyon HaBen.
274. ↑ Yam Shel Shlomo Kiddushin Chapter 1 Siman 54.
275. ↑ Bahag Siman 73.
276. ↑ Responsa of the Rashba Part 1 Siman 198, and see Rivash Tashbetz 51 Part 2; Rokeach Siman 360 in the name of RIBaK of Mainz, RIBaK of Speyer, and Ra’AM.
277. ↑ Rokeach there.
278. ↑ Meshivat Nefesh Bamidbar Chapter 1.
279. ↑ Rokeach there in the name of R"M, brother of RIBaK of Mainz.
280. ↑ Rivash there.
281. ↑ Rabbi Yosef Korkos. Beit Yosef.
282. ↑ Meshivat Nefesh Bamidbar 1.
283. ↑ Responsa of the Rashba Part 1 Siman 198.
284. ↑ Rivash Tashbetz 51 Part 3 (15b); Tur.
285. ↑ Maharil Laws of Redemption of the Firstborn.
286. ↑ Sefer Mitzvot Katan Siman 245.

287. ↑ Yam Shel Shlomo Kiddushin Chapter 1 Siman 54.
288. ↑ Devar Shmuel (Abohab) Siman 266, based on Gemara Kiddushin 59a, that if given within the time and the money was consumed, it is preferable to a loan, and nevertheless in the redemption of the firstborn it does not help, see above, and all the more so a loan; RIT Algazi Bekhorot Chapter 8 Letter 76 Subsection 1; Avnei Miluim Siman 28 Subsection 16; Responsa Mikhtam LeDavid Yoreh De'ah Siman 50.
289. ↑ Mikhtam LeDavid there.
290. ↑ See also Loan Citation 203.
291. ↑ Devar Shmuel there; RIT Algazi there.
292. ↑ Exodus 22:27.
293. ↑ Mikhtam LeDavid there.
294. ↑ See above.
295. ↑ See Devar Shmuel there in the name of the questioner; see Avnei Miluim there, and see there that he questioned that it is not so and the loan is considered actual money, and see Devar Shmuel there.
296. ↑ Mikhtam LeDavid there.
297. ↑ See also Money Citation 171 and onwards.
298. ↑ See below.
299. ↑ Mikhtam LeDavid there.
300. ↑ Pesikta and Shemot Rabbah Exodus 13.
301. ↑ See also Blessing of the Commandments, note 91 and onwards.
302. ↑ Responsa of R. Isaac ben Plet in Responsa of the Rashba, Part 1, Siman 18 and more.
303. ↑ See note 66 and onwards.
304. ↑ Sha'arei Yosher, Sha'ar Heh, Chapter 25, in the words of the Rosh, Bekhorot, Chapter 8, end of Siman 5. And see Rabbeinu Bahya, Shemot 34:20.
305. ↑ See Responsa Minchat Shlomo, Part 1, Siman 37 in the author's note.
306. ↑ Sha'arei Yosher, Siman 25, and see Responsa Chatam Sofer, Yoreh De'ah, Part 2, Siman 292.
307. ↑ See Beraita, Bekhorot 51b; Tosefta, Bekhorot, Chapter 6; see Rambam, Bikurim, Chapter 11, Halacha 7; see Tur and Shulchan Aruch, Yoreh De'ah, 305:7.
308. ↑ Beraita in the Gemara there and Tosefta there; Rambam there; Tur and Shulchan Aruch there. And see Panim Yafot, Bamidbar 3:47, that it is impossible to redeem from several priests, and see Responsa Beit Yitzchak, Table of Contents, Yoreh De'ah, Part 2, Siman 129 and Responsa Shevut Yaakov, First Edition, Part 1, Siman 223 and Amudei Beit, Laws of Redemption of the Firstborn, Siman 8, who were puzzled by it.
309. ↑ Keriat Sefer, Bikurim there.
310. ↑ See Rashi, Bekhorot there, s.v. "in this", according to the version of R. Joseph Korkos, Bikurim there, and Maharshal in his commentary on the Tur and Bach, Yoreh De'ah there, and Tzafnat Paneach, Bekhorot there, and R. Yom Tov Algazi, Bekhorot, Chapter 8, Siman 81, letter 8 in his words, according to the Tosefta there, and see R. Yom Tov Algazi there that the

Beraita in the Gemara there is according to the version before us; Maharshal there; Perisha, Yoreh De'ah there, subparagraph 11. And see Chokhmat Adam, General Rule 150, Siman 2, and Pitchei Teshuva, Yoreh De'ah there in his name, who wrote in the words of Rashi the opposite, that with one priest it must be given at once, and it needs clarification.

311. ↑ Rashi there, s.v. "at once". And see R. Gershom Meor HaGolah there, who says that he gave to each one separately and at once.
312. ↑ See Tosafot, Bekhorot 48b, s.v. "of Rabbi"; Rambam and Tur and Shulchan Aruch there, and see R. Joseph Korkos and Bach there in their opinion. And so it is according to the words of Rashi according to the version of the Shitah Mekubetzet, Bekhorot there in his words. And see R. Yom Tov Algazi there who says that this was the version of the Rambam in the Beraita in the Gemara there, and see R. Joseph Korkos there that the Beraita in the Gemara is also according to the version before us. And see Chasdei David on the Tosefta there.
313. ↑ Responsa Chatam Sofer, Yoreh De'ah, Part 2, Siman 297.
314. ↑ Chokhmat Adam there. And see R. Yom Tov Algazi there and Amudei Beit there.
315. ↑ Beit Yitzchak there.
316. ↑ See Rashi in note 208.
317. ↑ R. Yom Tov Algazi there, and there in the words of Rashi mentioned above. And see Or Gadol, Bekhorot, Chapter 8, Mishnah 8.
318. ↑ Responsa of the Chatam Sofer, brought in Ot Berit (Kunitz), Yoreh De'ah there, and Ot Berit there in his opinion.
319. ↑ R. Yom Tov Algazi there in the words of Tosafot, Bekhorot 48b, s.v. "of Rabbi".
320. ↑ Amudei Beit there.
321. ↑ See above.
322. ↑ See Meshiv Devarim, Siman 179, who discussed this in his response to Adar'et, and proved from the aforementioned Responsa of Chatam Sofer that they are combined, and see Or Sameach, Bikurim there, Halacha 16, that the law is like this when given to a priest initially as a gift on condition to return.
323. ↑ Ot Berit there.
324. ↑ Minchat Chinuch, Mitzvah 392.
325. ↑ Aruch HaShulchan, Yoreh De'ah, Siman 305, subparagraph 26, and see there that although "giving" was stated in the redemption of the firstborns in the wilderness, in the redemption of the firstborn for generations it was not stated.
326. ↑ See Tzafnat Paneach below.
327. ↑ See Tzafnat Paneach on Maaser Sheni 6:12 and Terumot 1:1, that this is the intention of the Tosefta there that if he gave to five priests he has fulfilled, whereas the baraita in the Gemara there and Rambam and Tur Shulchan Aruch hold that he has fulfilled when he gave to ten priests, their opinion is that there is giving with less than a sela.
328. ↑ See also Kohen Tzion 1068.

329. ↑ Minchat Pitim Yoreh De'ah there.
330. ↑ See Tzion 83.
331. ↑ Tzafnat Paneach Yesodei HaTorah 6:3.
332. ↑ Baraita Kiddushin 29a.
333. ↑ Responsa of the author of Chavot Da'at and Netivot HaMishpat in Responsa Chemdat Shlomo Yoreh De'ah siman 32.
334. ↑ Minchat Chinuch mitzvah 392.
335. ↑ Responsa Meshiv Davar part 2 siman 87.
336. ↑ Tosafot Shevuot 4b s.v. Bechol Podin. See Tzafnat Paneach on Maaser Sheni 1.
337. ↑ Sifrei Zuta Bamidbar 18.
338. ↑ Bekhorot 51a.
339. ↑ See Rosh and Ritva Algazi, Birkhat Shmuel Kiddushin siman 18.
340. ↑ See also Bechor Adam Tzion 88.
341. ↑ Ritva Algazi chapter 8 letter 67.
342. ↑ See Rashi Bekhorot 47b s.v. Sheharei; see Rosh Bekhorot chapter 8 siman 3, and Tosafot HaRosh in Shitah Mekubetzet Bekhorot there. And see Responsa Meshiv Davar part 2 siman 87.
343. ↑ Ha'amash Sheilta 118 subsection 4 in the opinion of the Sheiltot there; Tosefet Chaim in Shitah Mekubetzet Bekhorot there. And see Raggam in Bekhorot there.
344. ↑ Tzion 88 and onwards.
345. ↑ Maharil Hilchot Pidyon HaBen; Yeshut Kiddushin chapter 1 siman 54, from the responsa of Maharam Mintz.
346. ↑ Tzion 91 and onwards.
347. ↑ Or Zarua part 1 siman 792 (regarding one whose son died after 30 days, and all the more so in every Pidyon HaBen).
348. ↑ See also Matanot Kehuna.
349. ↑ See also Tovat Hana'ah.
350. ↑ Machaneh Ephraim Hilchot Zechiyah U'Matanah siman 8. And see Amudei Beit Hilchot Pidyon HaBen siman 1.
351. ↑ Responsa Meshiv Davar, Part 2, Siman 87.
352. ↑ Netivot HaMishpat, Siman 243, Subsection 8, and in his response in Responsa Hemdat Shlomo, Yoreh De'ah, Siman 32, Ot 3.
353. ↑ See Bekhorot 48a; see Kiddushin 29a.
354. ↑ Rashi on Bekhorot there, s.v. "Ha".
355. ↑ Bekhorot there.
356. ↑ Responsa Rashba, Part 2, Siman 321.
357. ↑ Minchat Chinuch, Mitzvah 392.
358. ↑ See also Encumbered Properties and see Lien.
359. ↑ Tosafot on Bekhorot 49b, s.v. "V'didei" and Turei Even on Shabbat Kodesh there, in Explanation 1.
360. ↑ Tosafot there and Turei Even there, in Explanation 2. And see above.
361. ↑ Turei Even there.
362. ↑ Tosafot and Turei Even there.

363. ↑ See below. Tosafot on Bekhorot 49b, s.v. “V’didei”; Ketzot HaChoshen, Siman 243, Subsection 7.
364. ↑ Minchat Chinuch, Mitzvah 392.
365. ↑ See Hagahot Maimoniot, Talmud Torah, Chapter 1, Ot 1 from Maharam of Rothenburg; Responsa Rashba, Part 2, Siman 321; Chatzotzrot Siman 105.
366. ↑ Chatzotzrot there.
367. ↑ See Citation 39.
368. ↑ See Citation 41.
369. ↑ Responsa Rashba there.
370. ↑ Minchat Chinuch, Mitzvah 392.
371. ↑ Chut HaShani, Siman 92.
372. ↑ Pitchei Teshuva, Yoreh De’ah, Siman 305, Subsection 15.
373. ↑ The Inquirer (Rabbi Shem Tov Halevi, associate of the Rivash and Tashbetz) in Rivash, Siman 131, and see Darkei Moshe, Yoreh De’ah, Siman 305, Subsection 9, which implies this is the opinion of the Rivash, and see Derashot Chazon Ish, Bekhorot, Chapter 8, Ot 17, and see Responsa Chatam Sofer, Yoreh De’ah, Part 2, Siman 296, and see below; Rema in Shulchan Aruch, Yoreh De’ah, Siman 305, 10; Levush there; Chatam Sofer, Chullin 87a and Yoreh De’ah, Siman 297.
374. ↑ The Inquirer in Rivash there.
375. ↑ See also Commandments and see Agency.
376. ↑ Levush there.
377. ↑ Exodus 13:13, and more.
378. ↑ Tzedah LaDerech Exodus there in the name of some of our contemporary sages, and see Yad Eliyahu (of Lublin) Siman 51.
379. ↑ Exodus 13:13.
380. ↑ Exodus there 15.
381. ↑ Yad Eliyahu there. And see Responsa Chatam Sofer Yoreh De’ah Part 2 Siman 295, another reason that there is no agency in the redemption of the firstborn, and see Aruch HaShulchan Yoreh De’ah there for additional reasons. And see Responsa Maharam Shik Yoreh De’ah Siman 14.
382. ↑ See the words of the questioner in Rivash there.
383. ↑ See Ran Pesachim 7b (3b, and see Chiddushei HaRan Pesachim there and in the notes); Tzedah LaDerech there, and there that even the questioner in the aforementioned Rivash agrees with this; Derech Chaim Bechorot Chapter 8 Note 17, and there that the aforementioned Rivash’s response is not to Rivash; Responsa Mahari Bruna Siman 209; Taz Yoreh De’ah 305 Note 11, and there that the aforementioned Rivash did not agree with the words of the questioner; Shach there Note 11; Divrei Shmuel (Abohab) Siman 267; see Shaarei Meisharim Ishut Chapter 6 Halacha 2 at its end (and see Acharonim cited in Note 139); Dagul MeRevavah Yoreh De’ah there (and there that it is preferable to redeem through an agent than for the father to redeem when the son is not with him and he does not know if he has left the status of a stillborn); in the Gra there. And see Beit Meir Yoreh

De'ah there, that one should not appoint the agent before the time of redemption, and see Dagul MeRevavah there and Aruch HaShulchan Yoreh De'ah there Note 9.

384. ↑ Tzedah LaDerech there.
385. ↑ See also Agency.
386. ↑ Tzedah LaDerech there.
387. ↑ Divrei Shmuel there.
388. ↑ Exodus 12:12.
389. ↑ Passover Haggadah.
390. ↑ Responsa Chatam Sofer Yoreh De'ah Part 2 Siman 293-294.
391. ↑ See below.
392. ↑ See also Agency. The questioner (Maharshech Acharon, author of Kohenet Olam) in Responsa Chatam Sofer Yoreh De'ah Part 2 Siman 293.
393. ↑ Response of the author of Chavot Da'at and Netivot HaMishpat in Responsa Chemed Shlomo Yoreh De'ah Siman 32 Note 3; Chatam Sofer Yoreh De'ah Part 2 Siman 297.
394. ↑ Chatam Sofer there.
395. ↑ See below.
396. ↑ In Chemed Shlomo there.
397. ↑ Avnei Nezer below.
398. ↑ Avnei Nezer Yoreh De'ah Siman 395-396, and see there for the reason.
399. ↑ Taz there in the words of the questioner in Rivash there; Responsa Meshiv Davar Part 2 Siman 87; Chazon Ish Yoreh De'ah Siman 185, and there in the words of R. Akiva Eiger below. And it needs clarification, because it seems that even if agency is required for this, agency would be effective for a minor, as when one sends his friend to bind tefillin on the sender's hand, it certainly works.
400. ↑ Hafla'ah Ketubot 74a, and see there his proof from Bechorot 50a. R. Akiva Eiger and the version of Maharsha Yoreh De'ah there.
401. ↑ Chazon Ish there.
402. ↑ Chazon Ish there.
403. ↑ And see Shut Chatam Sofer YD part 2 siman 296, that a Kohen should not become an agent for the redemption of the firstborn, because it degrades his own priesthood.
404. ↑ The questioner (Rabbi Shem Tov Halevi, associate of the Rivash and Tashbetz) in Rivash siman 131, and Darkei Moshe YD 305 se'if katan 9 which implies that this is the opinion of the Rivash, and see below; Rema in Shulchan Aruch YD 305:10; Levush there.
405. ↑ Rema and Levush there. And this is without the agency of the father, and see the next citation. And see below if the father can redeem through an agent.
406. ↑ Teshuvat Maharam Matz, brought in Yam Shel Shlomo Kiddushin chapter 1 siman 54 and in the glosses of Maharshal on Tur YD 305. And it appears that the redemption does not relate to the father, but others can redeem on their own behalf, and so it appears from the Ritva below, and so it appears

from Yam Shel Shlomo below who wrote that when another redeems, the father loses the mitzvah, and see Nedarim 36b and Tosafot and Rashba and Sha'ar Efraim there, and so it is in Machaneh Efraim and in the Gra below.

407. ↑ Ritva Pesachim 7b; see Derech Chaim Bechorot chapter 8 note 17, and there that the aforementioned Teshuvat Rivash is not from the Rivash.
408. ↑ Yam Shel Shlomo there. And see Shut Chemdat Shlomo YD siman 31 note 11, that even if a person donates from his own for the fruits of his friend, it is because the mitzvah is not imposed on the owner, but the redemption of the firstborn is imposed on the father, and also on the son when there is no father, and therefore another cannot redeem without their knowledge.
409. ↑ See below.
410. ↑ Tzedah LaDerech Shemot 13:13, and there that this is the opinion of Maharal of Prague and so agreed his son-in-law Rabbi Yitzchak Katz, and there is no proof from the words of the aforementioned Rivash that he agreed with the questioner, and also from the words of the questioner himself there is no necessity that another cannot redeem. And see there that the grandfather is preferable to anyone to redeem him, for grandchildren are like children, and like the commandment of Torah study that a person is commanded to teach his grandson, see there.
411. ↑ See Agency.
412. ↑ See Tosafot Ketubot 11a s.v. Matbilin.
413. ↑ See the aforementioned Tosafot and see also Zakhin LeAdam Shelo Befanav citation 613 and onwards. See Nekudat HaKesef below.
414. ↑ Nekudat HaKesef YD there se'if katan 1; Machaneh Efraim laws of acquisition and gift siman 7; see Shut Yad Eliyahu (of Lublin) siman 51, regarding those who hold there is agency in the redemption of the firstborn.
415. ↑ Machaneh Efraim there.
416. ↑ See citation 32.
417. ↑ Shach there se'if katan 20. And see Aruch HaShulchan YD there se'if 14 for an additional reason not to delay the redemption, so that the mitzvah is fulfilled in its essence when he reaches thirty days.
418. ↑ See also Zakhin LeAdam Shelo Befanav citation 8 and onwards. Nekudat HaKesef there. And see citation 122. And see Shut Chatam Sofer YD part 2 siman 295, regarding acquisition for a minor by the court.
419. ↑ See below.
420. ↑ Machaneh Efraim there; in the Gra YD there; see Shut Meshiv Davar part 2 siman 87.
421. ↑ Taz YD there se'if katan 11. And see Yad Eliyahu there, who rejected, that before the son grows up, redemption by others is not an obligation for him, for he cannot redeem himself, and even if when he grows up and can redeem himself he will not be pleased that others redeemed him, behold then he is an adult and they can acquire for an adult even when there is a side of obligation.
422. ↑ See below. Derech Chaim there, and there that this is the opinion of Rabbi Nathan in Mahari"l in citation 32 who hung a plate for a minor who was not redeemed and was not redeemed by another, and see there that he is in

doubt about the matter, and therefore he commanded to make for the one who redeemed him a plate that says “doubtfully redeemed,” and see Ketzot HaChoshen siman 243 se’if katan 7 and Shut Chatam Sofer YD part 2 siman 295. And it appears that all this is when the father died before the son became thirty days old, but if he died afterwards the father was already obligated, and if he had assets they would redeem from them even after his death, and therefore others can redeem in place of the father who died.

423. ↑ See citation 16.
424. ↑ See citation 47.
425. ↑ Shut Chemdat Shlomo YD siman 31 note 8.
426. ↑ Ketzot HaChoshen Siman 243 Sif Katan 7. And see the glosses of Imrei Baruch to Yoreh De’ah there who added, that the redemption is not similar to terumah, for it does not permit anything, and even the redemption from the money of the redeemer does not have merit for the minor except in that he is exempt from redeeming himself, and since this obligation has not yet fallen upon him, it is not a merit.
427. ↑ Avnei Nezer Yoreh De’ah Siman 396.
428. ↑ Responsa of the author of Chavot Da’at and Netivot HaMishpat in Responsa Chemdat Shlomo there Siman 32.
429. ↑ See also Bechor Adam Tziyon 12.
430. ↑ Responsa Yeriat HaOhel Siman 15; see Ikkarei HaDat Yoreh De’ah Siman 33 Sif 5; Chayei Adam Klal 150 Siman 7 and 15; Responsa Toafot Re’em Siman 38; Kitzur Shulchan Aruch Siman 164 Sif 7; Aruch HaShulchan Yoreh De’ah there Sif 14, and there it seems that this is the custom.
431. ↑ See Responsa Chemdat Shlomo there; Responsa Vaya’an Avraham (Riyach) Yoreh De’ah Siman 4; Chazon Ish Yoreh De’ah Siman 185; Responsa Har Tzvi Yoreh De’ah Siman 242; Responsa Dovrei Maysharim Part 3 Siman 15. And see Responsa Tzitz Eliezer Part 9 Siman 28 Ot 7.
432. ↑ See Responsa Chatam Sofer Yoreh De’ah Part 2 Siman 296.
433. ↑ Minchat Chinuch Mitzvah 392.
434. ↑ See Derech Chaim Bechorot Chapter 8 Ot 17; see Ketzot HaChoshen Siman 243 Subsection 7.
435. ↑ Tosafot Pesachim and others; Responsa Maharam of Rothenburg Part 4 Siman 367; Responsa Rashba Part 1 Siman 935; Sefer HaChinuch Mitzvah 392; Rosh Bechorot Laws of Redemption of the Firstborn Siman 4 and in Responsa Klal 49 Siman 3.
436. ↑ Challah Chapter 4 Mishnah 9.
437. ↑ Jerusalem Talmud Challah Chapter 4 Halacha 4.
438. ↑ Bahag Siman 73, and the Eshkol (Albeck) Laws of Redemption of the Firstborn and Orchot Chaim Laws of Redemption of the Firstborn Ot 3 in his name; Sefer HaNiyar Siman 39. And see Responsa Maharsham Part 1 Siman 214 and Part 6 Siman 149.
439. ↑ See Maharsham there and see below.
440. ↑ Leviticus 21:6.
441. ↑ Bahag there and Eshkol and Orchot Chaim there. And see Sanhedrin 51b and Rashi there s.v. “and they shall be.”

442. ↑ See Machaneh Ephraim below in Tosafot Bava Metzia 71b s.v. “it is well” and according to Jerusalem Talmud Ma’aser Sheni Chapter 4 Halacha 4, and see also agency.
443. ↑ See Machaneh Ephraim Acquisition and Gift Siman 33 in Tosafot there. And see Minchat Chinuch Mitzvah 392 who wrote the reason according to Machaneh Ephraim because the redeemer only has benefit of the mitzvah, and since the benefit of the mitzvah is not money, according to those who hold so, there is no other mind to transfer and the agent is not the agent of the owner of the money, however see Machaneh Ephraim Laws of Acquisition and Gift Siman 8 that in the redemption of the firstborn the redeemer is considered a complete owner, and it requires further study.
444. ↑ Deuteronomy 18:3.
445. ↑ Deuteronomy there, regarding the foreleg, cheeks, and stomach, and the same applies to other priestly gifts. And see Sifrei Deuteronomy 161: and he shall give to the priest, to the priest himself.
446. ↑ Netivot HaMishpat Siman 243 Sif Katan 10.
447. ↑ Responsa of Maharam of Metz brought in Yam Shel Shlomo Kiddushin Chapter 1 Siman 54 and glosses of Maharshal on the Tur Yoreh De’ah 305; Drisha Yoreh De’ah there Sif Katan 3; Machaneh Ephraim there: it seems; Imrei Baruch Laws of Redemption of the Firstborn Siman 6; Minchat Chinuch there. And see Minchat Chinuch there, who wrote the reason according to his above explanation, that since in the redemption of the firstborn there is no owner of the money, there is no need for an agent of the owner of the money, and furthermore, the redemption of the firstborn is a debt, and in the collection of a debt where the money is pledged to the lender, there is no need for an agent of the owner of the money. And see Machaneh Ephraim there, who explained the above Sifrei’s teaching in another way, and see Pri Chadash Yoreh De’ah Siman 61 Sif Katan 13 and Machaneh Ephraim there Siman 9, who explained in another manner, and see Tziyon 74.
448. ↑ Imrei Baruch there.
449. ↑ See above.
450. ↑ Responsa Chatam Sofer Yoreh De’ah Part 2 Siman 292.
451. ↑ See also “Zachin Le’adam Shelo Befanav” citation 70 and onwards.
452. ↑ Machaneh Ephraim, Laws of Acquisition, Siman 33; Netivot HaMishpat, Siman 243, Se’if Katan 10; Ot Brit, Siman 305, Se’if Katan 11.
453. ↑ See citation 41.
454. ↑ Responsa Chatam Sofer, Yoreh De’ah, Part 2, Siman 292, in the words of Perach Hadash, Yoreh De’ah, Siman 61, Se’if Katan 13.
455. ↑ Teshuvat Maharam Matz, brought in Yam Shel Shlomo, Kiddushin, Chapter 1, Siman 54 and the glosses of Maharshal on the Tur, Yoreh De’ah 305; Drisha, Yoreh De’ah, there, Se’if Katan 3; R. Yitzchak Elgazi, Bekhorot, Chapter 4, Ot 44, Se’if Katan 5 and Chapter 8, Ot 82, Se’if Katan 3; Responsa Chatam Sofer, Yoreh De’ah, Part 2, Siman 297; Amudei Beit HaLevi, Laws of Redemption of the Firstborn, Siman 7.
456. ↑ R. Yitzchak Elgazi, Chapter 8, there. And see Amudei Beit HaLevi, there.

457. ↑ See also “Zachin Le’adam Shelo Befanav” citation 70 and onwards.
458. ↑ R. Yitzchak Elgazi, Chapter 4, there. And see there that he is in doubt.
459. ↑ Chatam Sofer, there.
460. ↑ Amudei Beit HaLevi, there.
461. ↑ See above.
462. ↑ R. Yitzchak Elgazi, Bekhorot, Chapter 8, Ot 80, Se’if Katan 2.
463. ↑ Citation 55 and onwards.
464. ↑ Citation 663 and onwards.
465. ↑ See also “Kohen” citation 1068.
466. ↑ See above.
467. ↑ Minchat Chinuch, Mitzvah 392.
468. ↑ Amudei Beit HaLevi, below, that this is the custom of Ashkenazim in Jerusalem.
469. ↑ Amudei Beit HaLevi, Laws of Redemption of the Firstborn, end of Siman 8.
470. ↑ See citation 54.
471. ↑ See Tosafot, Bekhorot 49a, s.v. “Le’achar”, and Orchot Chaim below in their name; Orchot Chaim, Laws of Redemption of the Firstborn, in the name of some sages; Meiri, Pesachim 121b.
472. ↑ See citation 70.
473. ↑ Orchot Chaim, there, in the name of some sages. And see there the reason, that a person does not bless when repaying a debt, and it is like any other commandment, that even though it is a mitzvah, since it is like repaying a debt, one does not bless on it.
474. ↑ See above.
475. ↑ Meiri, there.
476. ↑ See Tosafot there, and Rosh Bekhorot Chapter 8, Siman 8 and Tur Yoreh De’ah 305 in the name of R"Y, and Sefer Mitzvot Katan 245, who were in doubt; Or Zaru’a there, that so in the name of; HaEshkol (Ratzba) end of Hilchot Pidyon HaBen (Siman 42); Meiri Pesachim 121b; Order and Custom of Pidyon HaBen by Maharil (Moriyah 65:66); Maharik Siman 49, due to doubt in blessings.
477. ↑ See Shitah Mekubetzet Bekhorot there in his version in Tosafot there; Rosh there; see Meiri there.
478. ↑ See also Birkhat HaZman Tziyon 122.
479. ↑ Or Zaru’a there.
480. ↑ See Tosafot there, and Rosh and Tur there in the name of R"Y, and Sefer Mitzvot Katan there, who were in doubt; from Yom Tov to Rosh there letter 60, according to the opinion of Rashba in his response (Part 1 Siman 245).
481. ↑ Rema Yoreh De’ah 305:12. And see Gra there.
482. ↑ Ran Sukkah 46a (22b).
483. ↑ Rema Yoreh De’ah 266.
484. ↑ Order and Custom of Pidyon HaBen by Maharil (Moriyah 65:66). And see Responsa Binyan Tziyon Siman 107.
485. ↑ Derech Chaim Bekhorot Chapter 8 letter 19.
486. ↑ Responsa Rashba Part 1 Siman 333.
487. ↑ See Yad Eliyahu (Regular) Part of the Writings Time letter 1.

488. ↑ See above.
489. ↑ Order and Custom of Pidyon HaBen by Maharil (Moriyah 65:66).
490. ↑ See Bava Kamma 80a and Rashi there s.v. Yeshu'a and Arukh entry Yesha, and see Terumat HaDeshen Part 1 Siman 269 that even Tosafot Bava Kamma there agree with this; HaParnas Siman 298; HaGamar Yevamot Siman 127 in the name of Maharam; Mahari Bruna Siman 121 in the name of Maharam; Terumat HaDeshen Part 1 Siman 268-269; see Yam Shel Shlomo Bava Kamma Chapter 7 Siman 37.
491. ↑ See HaParnas and HaGamar and Terumat HaDeshen and Mahari Bruna and Yam Shel Shlomo there.
492. ↑ See Maharil Hilchot Pidyon HaBen, and see Order and Custom of Pidyon HaBen by Maharil (Moriyah 65:66); Mahari Bruna there; Yosef Ometz Order and Laws of Pidyon HaBen; see Taz Yoreh De'ah 305 subparagraph 10.
493. ↑ Mahari Bruna there.
494. ↑ Maharil there.
495. ↑ Order and Customs of Pidyon HaBen by Maharil (Moriyah 65:66).
496. ↑ Mahari Bruna there.
497. ↑ Yam Shel Shlomo Kiddushin Chapter 1 Siman 54.
498. ↑ Responsa Rashba Part 1 Siman 199; see Meiri Pesachim 121b.
499. ↑ Rashba there.
500. ↑ Yam Shel Shlomo Kiddushin Chapter 1 Siman 54 in the name of the response of Maharam M"Z.
501. ↑ See Leket Yosher YD 62b.
502. ↑ Tziyon 47 and onwards. And see Rema in Shulchan Aruch Orach Chayim 496:8 and in Darkei Moshe there subparagraph 5, regarding Pidyon HaBen on Purim.
503. ↑ Yam Shel Shlomo Kiddushin 1:54 in the name of the responsa of Maharam Mintz. And see the poskim in Tziyon 376, and see Abudraham.
504. ↑ Maharam Mintz there.
505. ↑ Orchot Chaim laws of Pidyon Bechorot 3 in the name of Gaon; Meiri Pesachim 121b.
506. ↑ Eshkol (Albeck) laws of Pidyon HaBen (98a); Orchot Chaim there.
507. ↑ See also Nedarim of Hekdesh and see Arachin.
508. ↑ See also Adam Tziyon 69.
509. ↑ See above.
510. ↑ Eshkol there.
511. ↑ Eshkol there (102b); Orchot Chaim there.
512. ↑ Meiri there.
513. ↑ Order and custom of Pidyon HaBen according to Maharil (Moriah 65-66).
514. ↑ Mahari Bruna 122 from Mordechai in the name of Tosafot; see Maharil laws of Pidyon HaBen; Yam Shel Shlomo Kiddushin 1:54, in the name of a responsa in gloss.
515. ↑ Numbers 18:8.
516. ↑ See Sotah 15a, and more. Mahari Bruna there; Yam Shel Shlomo there.
517. ↑ Question of Mahari Najara in responsa Maharitatz Chadashot 1.

518. ↑ HaParnas 297; Hagahot Mordechai Yevamot 127 in the name of Maharam and Mahari Bruna 121 in the name of Mordechai.
519. ↑ Ramban Bechorot 8 (62b); Hagahot Smak 245.
520. ↑ Order and custom of Pidyon HaBen according to Maharil.
521. ↑ Yam Shel Shlomo Kiddushin 1:54.
522. ↑ Mahari Bruna there.
523. ↑ Sefer HaNiyar 39.
524. ↑ Meiri Pesachim 121b and Rosh Kiddushin 1:41 and Bechorot laws of Pidyon Bechor 1 and Tur YD 305, in the name of Geonim; Rema to Shulchan Aruch YD there 10, and there that this is the custom “in these countries”.
525. ↑ Mahari Bruna there. And see order and custom of Pidyon HaBen according to Maharil (Moriah 65-66).
526. ↑ See Tziyon 212.
527. ↑ Bach Yoreh De’ah there.
528. ↑ Yosef Ometz, Order and Laws of Redemption of the Firstborn. And see there that if the son is not there, the father holds in his hand a folded sheet (diaper) folded in several folds until it somewhat resembles a child.
529. ↑ Mahari Bruna below.
530. ↑ The Parnas there; the Gemar there; Responsa Mahari Weil Siman 189, like there, when bringing the firstborn, and see there the text when the firstborn is not there, and see below; Mahari Bruna Siman 121.
531. ↑ Mahari Weil there.
532. ↑ Mahari Bruna there.
533. ↑ Maharil, Laws of Redemption of the Firstborn. And see Yosef Ometz there.
534. ↑ Rema to Shulchan Aruch Yoreh De’ah 305:10, and there that this is the custom “in these countries.”
535. ↑ Order and Custom of Redemption of the Firstborn by Maharil (Moriah 65:66).
536. ↑ Meiri Pesachim 121b in the name of the Geonim. And see Tziyon 386.
537. ↑ Exodus 34:20.
538. ↑ Meiri Pesachim 121b in the name of the Geonim.
539. ↑ Meiri there.
540. ↑ Meiri there.
541. ↑ Mahari Bruna below.
542. ↑ See Rishonim in Tziyon 368; Rosh Kiddushin Chapter 1 Siman 41 and Bekhorot, Laws of Redemption of the Firstborn Siman 1 and Tur Yoreh De’ah there in the name of the Geonim; Mahari Bruna Siman 121; Rema to Shulchan Aruch Yoreh De’ah there 10, and there that this is the custom “in these countries.”
543. ↑ See Tziyon 351.
544. ↑ Mahari Bruna there.
545. ↑ Piskei Siddur HaRav, Laws of Redemption of the Firstborn. And in many siddurim the text: This is my firstborn son, and he is the first to open the womb of his mother, and the Holy One, blessed be He, commanded to redeem him, as it is said, and his redemption from one month you shall redeem according to your valuation, five shekels of silver by the shekel of

the sanctuary, which is twenty gerahs, and it is said, Sanctify to me every firstborn, the first to open every womb among the children of Israel, among man and beast, it is mine. For the text for redeeming the son of others, see Responsa Yehuda Ya'aleh Part 2 Siman 257 and Responsa Divrei Yatziv Yoreh De'ah Siman 199.

546. ↑ Yeshuot Yaakov Kiddushin Chapter 1 Siman 53.
547. ↑ See Likutei HaPardes by Rashi, Matter of Redemption of the Firstborn; Orchot Chaim, Laws of Redemption of the Firstborns Siman 2; D"H to Rosh there letter 5, that this is the custom, and there that this is the implication of the blessing in Tziyon 365.
548. ↑ Orchot Chaim there.
549. ↑ See Sefer HaTanya Siman 98.
550. ↑ Orchot Chaim there in the name of some, and there that this is the custom of great and pious men not to ask.
551. ↑ See Teshuvot HaGeonim Sha'arei Teshuvah Siman 47; Rosh Kiddushin Perek 1 Siman 41 and Bekhorot Hilchot Pidyon Bekhor Siman 1 and Tur Yoreh De'ah Sha'ar HaShamayim in the name of the Geonim; See Orach Chaim Hilchot Pidyon Bekhorot Siman 3; Nimukei Yosef Kiddushin 29a; Seder U'Minhag Pidyon HaBen LeMahari"l (Moriah 65:66); Rema to Shulchan Aruch Yoreh De'ah there Siman 10, and there that this is the custom in these countries; Yosef Ometz Seder and Laws of Pidyon HaBen. The text in many siddurim: (b) What do you prefer, to give your firstborn son who is the first issue of the womb to his mother, or do you prefer to redeem him for five selaim as you are obligated by the Torah, and the father responds, I wish to redeem my son and here are five selaim as I am obligated by the Torah.
552. ↑ Numbers 18:15.
553. ↑ Numbers there 16.
554. ↑ Exodus 13:15.
555. ↑ Exodus 34:20. Teshuvot HaGeonim there (and perhaps the intention is not that the father says this entire text, but it comes to explain why the father repeats "redeem him and redeem him". And see Zohar Introduction (14a).
556. ↑ Yam Shel Shlomo Kiddushin Perek 1 Siman 53.
557. ↑ See Seder U'Minhag Pidyon HaBen LeMahari"l (Moriah 65:66), and there that a father or Kohen who do not understand the Holy Tongue, should learn to understand the text of the redemption, and if they cannot learn it is preferable that they say it in a language they understand.
558. ↑ Mahari Bruna Siman 121 in the note, and there that he heard again that this was the custom of the ancients.
559. ↑ See Mahari"l Hilchot Pidyon HaBen; Mahari Bruna there.
560. ↑ See below.
561. ↑ See below. Teshuvot HaGeonim there; Orach Chaim there.
562. ↑ Meshivat Nefesh Bamidbar 1.
563. ↑ Seder U'Minhag Pidyon HaBen LeMahari"l there.
564. ↑ See above.

565. ↑ See Chut HaShani below; Chokhmat Adam Klal 150 Siman 7.
566. ↑ Chut HaShani Siman 92. And see there that he elaborates that if the father does not redeem him and he remains in the possession of the Most High, it is possible that the Holy One, blessed be He, will take him from him, and therefore the father agrees to redeem him so that he remains his. And see there that he wrote that if he gave as if coerced by the word, the redemption would not be effective, and it needs clarification, for he agrees to the giving because of the commandment and it is not like the aforementioned case where he did not agree to give. And see Gilyon Maharsha Yoreh De'ah Sha'ar HaShamayim Siman 11, that the intention of the question is if the father would prefer to precede something to the opening of the womb so that he would not have a firstborn that requires redemption, and the father responds that the commandment is dear to him and he desires the birth of the firstborn.
567. ↑ See above.
568. ↑ Bach Yoreh De'ah Sha'ar HaShamayim.
569. ↑ See citation 207.
570. ↑ See Responsa Minchat Shlomo Part 1 Siman 37, in the author's note. And see Terumat HaDeshen Part 1 Siman 269, that because of the wording of the preference question, the redemption is similar to buying and selling and is forbidden on Shabbat. And see Aruch HaShulchan Yoreh De'ah there, who explained the preference question differently.
571. ↑ Leket Yosher Yoreh De'ah page 62 matter 2; See Mahari"l Hilchot Pidyon HaBen; Seder U'Minhag Pidyon HaBen LeMahari"l (Moriah 65:66); Mahari Bruna Siman 121.
572. ↑ Leket Yosher there; Mahari Bruna there. And see Mahari"l there that the vessel was borrowed, and is not given to the Kohen.
573. ↑ Leket Yosher Yoreh De'ah page 62 matter 1. And see Mahari Bruna there.
574. ↑ Leket Yosher there. And seemingly his intention is that the Kohen returns the vessel after the redemption.
575. ↑ Seder U'Minhag Pidyon HaBen LeMahari"l there.
576. ↑ See the order and custom of the redemption of the firstborn by Maharil there; see Yosef Ometz, the order and laws of the redemption of the firstborn.
577. ↑ See above: the blessings.
578. ↑ See Rosh Kiddushin Chapter 1, Siman 41 and Bekhorot, laws of the redemption of the firstborn, and Responsa, General 49, Siman 1, and Tur Yoreh De'ah there in the name of the Geonim; see Orach Chaim, laws of the redemption of the firstborn, Siman 2; see Maharil, laws of the redemption of the firstborn; see Tur Yoreh De'ah there; see Rema to Shulchan Aruch Yoreh De'ah there, Siman 10, and see Taz there, Subsection 9. And see citation 477.
579. ↑ Rambam, Bikkurim Chapter 11, Halacha 5; Sefer HaParnas, Siman 297; Hagahot Maimoniot, Yevamot, Siman 127 in the name of Maharam; Meiri, Pesachim 121b; Beit Yosef, Yoreh De'ah there, and there also that the Geonim and the Tur below agree with this.

580. ↑ Bach, Yoreh De'ah there, and there that this is the intention of the Geonim and the Tur below; Shach there, Subsection 9, and there that this is the intention of the Rema below.
581. ↑ See also the blessing of the commandments: before their performance. Beit Yosef there.
582. ↑ Taz there.
583. ↑ Sefer HaNiyar, Siman 39.
584. ↑ See Yad Eliyahu Regular, Part of the Writings, Time, Letter A in the note. And so it is printed in many prayer books that the Kohen receives the money and returns the son to his father before the blessings, and see Lehorot Natan, Volume 7, Siman 81, that it is a mistake.
585. ↑ See Orach Chaim there.
586. ↑ See Responsa Maharitatz, Siman 1.
587. ↑ See Orach Chaim there.
588. ↑ Siddur Rasag; Meiri, Pesachim 121b in the name of the Geonim; Temporary Commandments, laws of blessings. And see Rivash, Siman 156.
589. ↑ Sefer HaParnas, Siman 297; Hagahot Maimoniot, Yevamot, Siman 127 in the name of Maharam; Responsa Mahari Weil, Siman 189; Mahari Bruna, Siman 121. And see citation 372.
590. ↑ Responsa Maharitatz, the new ones, Siman 1 in the name of accurate machzorim. And see Yesh Shlomoh, Kiddushin Chapter 1, Siman 54, where the Kohen says: Your son is redeemed.
591. ↑ Numbers 18:16.
592. ↑ Exodus 13:1-2.
593. ↑ See Likutei HaPardes from Rashi, the matter of the redemption of the firstborn; Sefer HaTanya, Siman 98. And note that what he says to give the items to their owners is when he intends to return them to the father, see above. And see Shevach Tov, Exodus 13, which brings a version like this that the Kohen says before the act of redemption, and concludes that after the redemption the father says: If I have redeemed him properly, good, and if not, he shall be redeemed according to the Torah and the commandments as the law and the condition of the court and as the expert in Israel, and note that since the Kohen returns the money to him, the father says that he intends to redeem according to the law, and if his intention was for the Kohen to return the money, or he conditioned it in a way that cancels the redemption, see above, the intention or condition will be canceled and he will be redeemed according to the Torah, etc.
594. ↑ Siddur Rasag; Ha'itur, Gate 3, laws of circumcision (53a); Temporary Commandments there; see Menorat HaMaor (Alnakawa), Chapter 6, laws of the redemption of the firstborn.
595. ↑ Siddur Rasag, according to the opinion of those who practice to bless (and see citation 430 which disagrees and holds that one should not bless), and Abudraham below in his name. And see Abudraham there, that for this version the difficulty of the Rosh in citation 429 is resolved, that there is no sanctity of the firstborn while still in his mother's womb. And see the

commentary Iyun Tefillah in the Siddur Otzar HaTefillot in the version of the redemption of the firstborn, where some have corrected to read “who sanctified” instead of “who sanctified.”

596. ↑ Genesis 2:7.
597. ↑ Job 10:11.
598. ↑ Ramban below; Rashba below; Chinuch below; Rosh Kiddushin below; Orach Chaim below.
599. ↑ Rosh Bekhorot below.
600. ↑ Teshuvot HaGeonim below.
601. ↑ Job ibid. 12.
602. ↑ Deuteronomy 21:17. Teshuvot HaGeonim below; Ramban below; Orchot Chaim below, and there also the continuation of the verse.
603. ↑ From Yom Tov to Rosh Bechorot below letter D, as it is appropriate to read, for the mother is not obligated in redemption, and see to the questioner in Rivash Siman 131 and what Rivash answered there.
604. ↑ Numbers 18:15.
605. ↑ Numbers ibid. 16.
606. ↑ Numbers 3:47. So it is in Teshuvot HaGeonim below (and only the beginning of the verse is brought there) and in Orchot Chaim below, and in Meiri and Rosh below the last two verses are combined, apparently due to a mistake of similarity, and see Orchot Chaim there, and in Ramban below this verse is missing.
607. ↑ See Teshuvot HaGeonim below; see Ramban below; see Sefer HaChinuch below; Rosh below; see Orchot Chaim below; see Ohel Moed below.
608. ↑ See Teshuvot HaGeonim Sha’arei Teshuva Siman 47, as the heads of the yeshivot who fulfill the mitzvah of priesthood and are zealous in them practiced; Ramban Hilchot Bechorot Chapter 8 (62b) in the name of the Geonim; Responsa of Rashba Part 1 Siman 200 and Siman 958 in the name of R"Ch; see Sefer HaChinuch Mitzvah 392; Orchot Chaim Hilchot Pidyon Bechorot Siman 3 in the name of the Geonim; Meiri Pesachim 121b in the name of the Geonim; Tur Yoreh De’ah 305 in the name of the Geonim, and similarly in Rosh Bechorot Hilchot Pidyon Bechor Siman 1 and in Responsa K’lalei 49 Siman 1 and in Kiddushin Chapter 1 Siman 41 in the name of the Geonim, and Rivash Siman 131, and there the conclusion in singular language: sanctifies the firstborn of Israel for his redemption, and similarly in Ohel Moed Hilchot Pidyon HaBen, and Abudraham Hilchot Pidyon Bechor, and more. And see Kaf HaChaim Chapter 16, that the wording “his father says” etc. and “his mother says” etc. is not part of the priest’s blessing, but the father says etc. and the mother says etc., and there these sayings are brought after the conclusion of the priest’s blessing.
609. ↑ Teshuvot HaGeonim ibid. And in Orchot Chaim ibid.: sanctifies Israel in the redemption of firstborns.
610. ↑ Teshuvot HaGeonim ibid.; Sefer HaChinuch ibid.; Orchot Chaim ibid.
611. ↑ Orchot Chaim ibid. Siman 2. And see Minhagei Mitzrayim Yoreh De’ah letter 23, that the eldest of those present blesses.
612. ↑ See also Brit Milah citation 154.

613. ↑ Maharam Chalawa Pesachim 121b.
614. ↑ Rosh ibid. and ibid. and ibid. (the question on why the priest is not included in the mitzvah is not in Kiddushin, and see citation 517), and in Kiddushin ibid. that “in these lands” they practiced to bless, and in Abudraham ibid. in his name, that they practiced to bless in Spain. And see citation 410. And see the words of the questioner in Rivash Siman 131.
615. ↑ Siddur Rasag, and see Abudraham ibid. in his name.
616. ↑ Yesh Shlomoh Kiddushin Chapter 1 Siman 54. And see Shachna Gaon Yoreh De’ah Siman 305 Hagahot letter 13, as this is the custom of Constantinople and Turkey.
617. ↑ See Shachna Gaon ibid.
618. ↑ See Minhagei Mitzrayim Yoreh De’ah letter 23, and see Mizbeach Adama Yoreh De’ah Siman 305 as this is the custom of Jerusalem, and see Otzar Pidyon HaBen Chapter 18 note 52, as this is the custom in the Land of Israel.
619. ↑ The question of R. Y. Najara in Responsa Maharitatz HaChadashot Siman 1. And see above.
620. ↑ See citation 90.
621. ↑ Rivash ibid.
622. ↑ The question of R. Y. Najara ibid., and see there that he proved from the blessing “Who sanctified” that they bless at a Brit Milah, and see there that Maharitatz agreed with him and wrote that this question did not come from the mouth of the Rosh. And see Rivash ibid.
623. ↑ See Niddah 30b. Bach Yoreh De’ah ibid.
624. ↑ See also Bechor Adam.
625. ↑ Ramban ibid. And see Orchot Chaim ibid. that it is said that Ramban only disagreed on what the father says “and the first of my strength” etc., and see there and in Responsa Rashba ibid. the version of R"Ch: his father says this is my firstborn son and I am commanded to redeem him as it is said and every firstborn of man among your sons you shall redeem, and see Sefer HaChinuch ibid.
626. ↑ Rashba there. And see there that some mentioned his father and not his mother.
627. ↑ Numbers 3:8.
628. ↑ Orchot Chaim there: Another version. And see “Order of Redemption of the Firstborn by Our Early Rabbis”, in the collection Zekhor Le’Avraham 1992, 7-9, additional blessing versions.
629. ↑ See Maharil Laws of Redemption of the Firstborn; Mahari Bruna Siman 121; Rema in Shulchan Aruch Yoreh De’ah 305:14; Yosef Ometz Order and Laws of Redemption of the Firstborn.
630. ↑ Rema there.
631. ↑ Rema there.
632. ↑ See Panim Me’irot ShebaTzion 497.
633. ↑ Yosef Ometz there.
634. ↑ See Leket Yosher Yoreh De’ah 62b. And see Abudraham Laws of Redemption of the Firstborn, for those who bless “Who sanctified”.

635. ↑ See also Blessing of the Bread.
636. ↑ Taz Yoreh De’ah there Subsection 10.
637. ↑ Maharil there; Mahari Bruna there.
638. ↑ Derashot Chaim on Rosh Bechorot there Letter 4.
639. ↑ See Responsa Panim Me’irot Part 2 Siman 99 and Aruch HaShulchan Yoreh De’ah Siman 305 Section 45 and Likutei Pinchas Subsection 53 and Responsa Shiach Yitzchak Siman 249 and Responsa Betzel HaChochma Part 4 Siman 56.
640. ↑ Rashba below; Orchot Chaim and Kolbo below, and there also: This in exchange for that.
641. ↑ Teshuvot HaGeonim Sha’arei Teshuva Siman 47; Responsa Rashba Part 1 Siman 200 and Siman 1958 in the name of Rach; Sefer HaChinuch Commandment 392; Meiri Pesachim 121b in the name of Geonim; see Orchot Chaim below; Kolbo Siman 98, and there instead of “and for fear of Heaven”: and for good deeds; Abudraham Redemption of the Firstborn.
642. ↑ Orchot Chaim Laws of Redemption of the Firstborn Siman 3.
643. ↑ Darkei Moshe Yoreh De’ah 305 Subsection 8; Shachna Gaon Yoreh De’ah 305 Gloss 11.
644. ↑ See Sefer HaChinuch there; Meiri there.
645. ↑ Meiri there.
646. ↑ See Psalms 41:3.
647. ↑ Proverbs 3:2. And in Meiri below missing “and peace”.
648. ↑ Psalms 121:3.
649. ↑ Psalms there 6-8.
650. ↑ See Teshuvot HaGeonim there, in a short version; see Responsa Rashba there and there; Meiri Pesachim there. And in Rosh Bechorot Laws of Redemption of the Firstborn Siman 1 in the name of Geonim: And the priest blesses the son and returns him to his father and mother.
651. ↑ Meiri there.
652. ↑ M"B 3:11.
653. ↑ R"Sh Ba’al HaTosafot, cited in Teshuvot HaGeonim there.
654. ↑ Mahari Bruna Siman 122.
655. ↑ Deuteronomy 28:8.
656. ↑ See Leviticus 26:9.
657. ↑ Genesis 28:3-4.
658. ↑ Meiri there.
659. ↑ Meiri below.
660. ↑ HaParnas Siman 298; HaGamar Yevamot Siman 127 in the name of Maharam; Meiri Pesachim 121b; Tashbetz Part 1 Siman 268.
661. ↑ See above.
662. ↑ Orchot Chaim Hilchot Birkat HaMazon Ot 13 in the name of Tosafot; Mahari"l Hilchot Pidyon HaBen; Yam Shel Shlomo Kiddushin Chapter 1 Siman 54.
663. ↑ Yam Shel Shlomo there.

https://www.yeshiva.org.il/wiki/index.php/%D7%90%D7%A0%D7%A6%D7%99%D7%A7%D7%9C%D7%95%D7%A4%D7%93%D7%99%D7%94_%D7%AA%D7%9C%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%93%D7%99%D7%AA:%D7%A4%D7%93%D7%99%D7%95%D7%9F_%D7%94%D7%91%D7%9F